DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 477 UD 011 053

TITLE	ESEA Title I Components - Evaluation Reports, 1969-1970.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles Unified School District, Calif.
PUB DATE	Sep 70
NOTE	220p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$11.10
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement, *Ancillary Services, Delinquent Rehabilitation, Elementary Education, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Private Schools, *Program Evaluation, Reading Programs, School Community Relationship, Secondary Education, Special Education
IDENTIFIERS	California, *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I Programs

ABSTRACT

Contents of this compendium of technical reports on 1969-1970 Los Angeles City School programs funded under ESEA Title 1 are organized by division. Division of Elementary Education programs include reading, mathematics, English as a second language, teacher-librarian, pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, Follow Through, Intergroup Relations, Parent Involvement, Staff Development, Counseling, health services, pupil services and attendance; and nonpublic schcol reading, mathematics, and supportive services. Programs of the Division of Secondary Education include reading and mathematics core, supportive services, and nonpublic school instruction and supportive services. The Health Services Branch administers a program concerning neglected and delinquent children. A school-community relations program is administered by the Office of Urban Affairs. The Special Education Branch administers a Special Education for the Handicapped program. (JM)

ED044477

LOS ANGELES CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ESEA TITLE I COMPONENTS - EVALUATION REPORTS

1969 - 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VD011053

Measurement and Evaluation Branch

September 1970

FOREWORD

A five-year growth profile of ESEA programs in the Los Angeles City Schools would show, as in any human endeavor, great variability on almost any base one might select: kind of program, amount of funding, grade levels served, density of services, pupil-teacher ratios, curriculum materials, number of schools, degree of staff involvement, and extent of evaluation.

Spring 1966 brought the first ESEA funds to Los Angeles City Schools. Elementary programs that semester (11 in number) included Reading, Kindergarten, English as a Second Language, Preschool, and More Capable. Secondary activities (numbering 25) included Student Achievement Center, Teaching Standard Oral English as an Alternate Dialect, Dropout Counseling, Fine Arts (Artmobile), and Homemaking Education. Special projects in other divisions included Educational Diagnostic Center (Special Education), Camp Returnees, School-Age Expectant Mothers, and School-Community Relations Consultants. Cultural enrichment was emphasized wherever possible. Helping the lowest achiever was a common objective.

The programs were spread into as many public and nonpublic schools as the money could be stretched to reach.

The focus changed by 1969-70. Under new state guidelines, implemented during the year covered by this report, components were mandated, regardless of level: Reading and Mathematics Instruction, Auxiliary Services (health, counseling, and attendance), Parental Involvement, Intergroup Relations, and Staff Development. Saturated services were the thrust, with the objective of providing as much ESEA intervention as possible for each disadvantaged learner. All activities led toward one goal: improved achievement in reading and arithmetic.

With the largest funding in its ESEA history (approximately $20 million), the District assigned ESEA funds to 55 elementary schools and 15 junior high schools from September 1969 to August 1970 -- including selected summer school programs. Also, 38 nonpublic schools participated.

Guidelines mandated a per-capita expenditure for each child; projects concentrated on the younger grades; teacher accountability became a common phrase; performance objectives entered the evaluation field, replacing less definitive behavioral objectives; local-school principals and their staffs had unprecedented autonomy in writing individual proposals for the educational program at their school, including budget and staffing; the community became inextricably more involved in the education of their children; and many parents became advisors to District administrators and teachers.

Hard data from standardized achievement tests seemed to say that the learners were learning better than before.

Findings printed in this report pertain only to 1969-70, and not to four and a half years of ESEA operation. We must repeat cautions given in earlier years about the tenuousness of test results, attitude ratings, and questionnaire ratings from parents and staff. But at the conclusion of this first year under the new guidelines, evaluative findings for all components are encouraging.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Division of Elementary Education	
Reading	1
Mathematics	25
English as a Second Language	33
Teacher-Librarian	39
Pre-Kindergarten	45
Kindergarten	55
Follow Through	63
Intergroup Relations	67
Parent Involvement	79
Staff Development	89
Counseling	97
Health Services	105
Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA)	113
Nonpublic School Reading	119
Nonpublic School Mathematics	125
Nonpublic School Supportive Services Parent Involvement, Staff Development and Intergroup Relations	131
Division of Secondary Education	
Reading and Mathematics Core	137
Supportive Services Parent Involvement, Auxiliary Services, Staff Development and Intergroup Relations	145
Nonpublic School Instruction and Supportive Services	157

	Page
Health Services Branch	
Neglected and Delinquent Children	195
Office of Urban Affairs	
School-Community Relations Program	205
Special Education Branch	
Special Education for the Handicapped	213

LIST OF STANDARDIZED TESTS

1969 - 1970

NAME OF TEST	FORM	GRADE LEVEL
Elementary and Secondary		
Caldwell Preschool Inventory, Revised		Pre-K
Metropolitan Readiness Test	Form B	K,1(Pre)
Cooperative Primary Reading Test	Form 12A	1(Post)
Cooperative Primary Mathematics Test	Form 23A	3
Stanford Reading Test	Primary I, Form W	2(Pre)
Stanford Reading Test	Primary II, Form W	2(Post), 3(Pre)
Stanford Reading Test	Primary II, Form X	3(Post)
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Reading, Language, and Arithmetic	Level 2, Form R	4,5,6(Post) 6(Pre-NPS)
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Reading, Language, and Arithmetic	Level 2, Form Q	6(Pre)
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Reading, Language, and Arithmetic	Level 3, Form Q	7,8,9(All pre)
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Reading, Language, and Arithmetic	Level 3, Form R	7,8,9(All post)
Nonpublic Schools		
Cooperative Primary Mathematics Test	Form 23A	2(Post), 3
Stanford Reading Test	Primary II, Form Y	2,3(Post)
Metropolitan Achievement Tests - Intermediate Science Test	Form Am	7,8
Special Education		
Metropolitan Readiness Test	Form B	K,1
Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	Survey B, Form 1	2,3
Cooperative Primary Mathematics Test	Form 23A	3
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Reading	Level 2, Form Q	4,5,6

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: READING

Abstract

Pupils	53,751
Schools	55
Teachers	175
Approximate Cost	$3,801,611

Description: The Reading program served almost 54,000 pupils, grades one through six, in the 55 ESEA Title I schools. Two general strategies, direct instruction or instructional assistance, were employed in varying degrees, according to priorities established at each school.

Most schools emphasized increased pupil contacts either through addition of reading specialists to provide direct instruction to pupils or through assignment of aides to assist the classroom teachers. Some schools sought to improve instruction primarily through staff development and the assignment of resource teachers and consultants to help classroom teachers directly in the improvement of instruction. These two emphases were not mutually exclusive, and their relative weight varied greatly from school to school.

More than 400 persons served the reading program in some capacity, many of these personnel performing multiple functions. Some personnel who functioned as reading teachers actually held titles other than reading teacher or specialist. Music and physical education teachers supplemented the work of reading teachers by stressing development of listening and motor skills. Personnel were assigned to provide flexibility in grouping and instruction and increased opportunity for interaction between children and adults.

In most schools the reading teacher took a small group of pupils from their regular classroom to a room suitable for small-group instruction, leaving the classroom teacher with the remaining pupils. In other schools, where a separate room was not available, the reading teacher worked with a group in the regular classroom, the classroom teacher still working with the remaining pupils. In some cases the reading teacher and classroom teacher, as a team, shared the planning and responsibility for instruction of the entire class.

Several schools instituted departmentalized reading programs in which heterogeneously grouped classes were redistributed into homogeneous ability groups. Incorporation of a reading teacher into this type of organization was another means of lowering the pupil-teacher ratio. For the most part such groupings were done within a grade, rather than across grades. However, some schools used multigraded or ungraded instructional groupings, in most cases at primary levels.

Time Intervals: The component operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. There was variation among schools, however, because of delays in allocation of funds and availability of personnel.

Reading instructional time varied from about 30 minutes daily in a few primary classes to more than two hours a day.

Activities: Extensive use was made of learning or multimedia centers, Typically these utilized vocabulary building and word games; listening centers; individual chalk boards; Durrell, SRA, Peabody Kits, etc.; tape recorders; phonographs; film and slide projectors; EFI Audio-Flashcard System; and a multiplicity of manipulative and game-type learning materials.

Instructional activities most commonly involved basal reader approaches used in conjunction with a wide range of supplementary materials and methods. Non-basal methods most frequently identified as major or supplementary approaches included Sullivan, Language Experience, motor skills, linguistic, phonetic, individualized, tutorial, Malabar Program, and ita.

A program of inservice education was conducted to assist participants in fulfillment of the objective.

Each elementary area had its own pattern of monthly inservice for all or some of its resource teachers, consultants, and reading specialists. These personnel, in turn, conducted local inservice sessions to disseminate the information they gained in the area meetings. In some cases, area personnel arranged special demonstrations for local schools or for groups of personnel with particular needs or interests. In addition, each school had its own pattern of inservice training which drew on outside resources as well as local school and area personnel.

Inservice training stressed preparation and use of materials, instructional techniques, methods of individualizing instruction, diagnosis and remediation of reading problems, and the effects of poverty on children.

Objective:

- To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations
  Raise the median gain of project participants in reading by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests

Evaluation Strategy: Overall evaluation was based on results of standard achievement tests administered pre and post to each pupil in grades one through six. In the first grades this task was complicated by non-equivalence of the tests. Here comparisons were based on relative position to norm populations pre and post.

Comparison schools were not available because of the saturation of the district over the past several years with various District and specially funded reading programs.

Reading programs were categorized according to three ways in which they affected pupils: (1) Treatment - the personnel who taught pupils and their effect on the size of the instructional group (e.g., reading specialist with or without aide, classroom teacher with or without aide, teacher-specialist combinations, etc.); (2) Organization - the manner in which pupils were grouped for instruction (e.g., ungraded vs. graded, or divided day vs. regular day); and (3) Materials - the principal materials used as the basis for reading instruction.

Another major variable in program evaluation was the average minutes of daily instruction received by the group to which the pupil was assigned for reading instruction.

Results: The Title I schools, as a whole, achieved the stated objective of one year's growth in one school year; that is, 0.1 grade level per school month. Pupils in the upper three grades equaled or exceeded the goal. Only at the second grade level did the District's Title I children fall distinctly short of the goal, while third graders fell barely short. First graders could not be directly compared, but they showed a distinct jump in relative percentile rankings between fall and spring testing periods.

Relatively large differences between schools and areas appeared in achievement scores.

Conclusions: Overall, the Reading component succeeded in meeting its stated objective of improving by 0.1 grade level per school month the reading achievement of pupils in the Title I schools. Wide variability in achievement scores was observed between areas and between schools and grades. Further analyses of the data will attempt to discover relationships to reading achievement of a number of instructional variables (i.e., treatment, organization, materials and time. The lesser rates of growth observed at the second and third grades must be interpreted with caution; nearly half of the children at those grades were not included in the reported sample because pretest scores were not readily available in the local school.

Recommendations: Program descriptions and personnel functions and relationships within programs need to be stated in operational (i.e., observable) terms so that evaluation of program efficacy may be made in less equivocal terms. Terminology describing differing instructional treatments should be standardized; e.g., use of terms like "team teaching", when departmentalization is meant.

Tests should be administered under controlled conditions by trained personnel and should be scored by scoring clerks to insure standard conditions and interpretation, as well as to speed turnaround of results to personnel needing the data for planning, evaluation, etc.

READING

Detailed Report

This report covers preliminary analyses of data on reading achievement. More detailed analyses of the scores in terms of their relationships to a number of instructional variables (i.e., treatment, organization, materials, time) and institutional or status variables (i.e., sex, class, grade, school, area) will require additional study.

Tests used in the state-mandated testing program were employed in the evaluation. The same basic test was used pre and post, except at the first-grade level. This exception was necessary because a reading test is not appropriate for beginning first graders, and a readiness test is not appropriate at the end of the first grade. The tests used at each grade level are listed in Table A, along with the dates of the testing period and the interval in months between tests. Consideration of the latter figure is important, since the objective of one year's growth in one year's time is interpretable as being equivalent to 0.1 grade level growth per school month.

Objective: To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations. Raise the median gain of project participants in reading by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests.

As a group the schools achieved the objective when it is viewed in terms of months' gain matched with months of instruction between testing periods. Based on median raw scores, only second-grade pupils were distinctly short of the goal. Also, third graders fell somewhat short; however, these findings may have been affected by the loss of slightly more than half of the pretest scores for second and third graders. Losses from the total enrollment at other grade levels ranged from 24% at the sixth grade to 30% at the first grade. While there is no way to be sure what changes in data would have occurred had the missing pupils been included, it is fairly axiomatic that such losses tend to be biased in the direction of poorer achieving pupils.

When all pupils tested at the three upper grades (rather than the more restricted group who had completed both pre- and posttests) are considered, the differences between their mean raw scores and those of the matched group were not more than 0.4 of a point lower for the pretest, and 0.9 of a point or less at the posttest period. The losses from total population for the unmatched sample at the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades were 12%, 11%, and 10%, respectively. These small raw score differences resulted in a deficit of 0.1 year from the grade equivalents observed for the matched groups at the three upper grades.

Percentile ranks were reported for results on the two tests given at the first grade level. However, the two tests appear to measure different sets of abilities (r^2=.11). For the ESEA pupils who took both tests, only about 11% of the score on the posttest (Cooperative Primary Reading Test) may be explained by the score on the pretest (Metropolitan Readiness Test). Therefore, the tests are not directly comparable, and changes in percentile rank may be explainable in terms of initial differences in the pupils' abilities not measured by the MRT, as well as differences in the two norm populations.

On the Cooperative Primary Reading Test first graders in the ESEA schools as a group scored slightly above the national average.

At the second- and third-grade levels, the gain based on mean scores was 0.8 in the 10-month period; but, since more than half the sample was lost, it probably is inadvisable to attempt to interpret the finding.

The largest difference appeared for matched pupils at the fourth grade, which showed a gain of one year in seven months of instruction time. The fifth grade improved by 0.8 or 0.9, depending on whether the larger unmatched group or the matched group is considered. The sixth grade, with only a six-month interval between tests, showed growth of 0.9 (matched) and 0.8 (unmatched) reflecting a rate of growth in excess of one month gain per month of instruction.

Most scores were reported in terms of mean raw score rather than median raw score. Means are susceptible to a small number of extremely high or extremely low scores; medians provide a more stable way of viewing groups of scores--as the exact midpoint of all the scores, they are less susceptible to extremes. Table B shows grade equivalents, percentiles, and gains for each grade by both mean and median raw scores. For the three upper grades these figures are shown for both matched and unmatched samples--nine comparisons in all. For gain scores (excluding first grade) medians are lower in four comparisons, higher in one, and the same in three. For "Years Below Grade Level," except at the third grade, all median decrements from grade level were greater than those based on mean scores. However, because state reports requested mean scores and results based on mean scores were rather widely published, means were used in the remainder of this report, unless otherwise noted.

Tables C-1 through C-3 contain tabulations for grades 1-3 of pre- and posttest scores, materials, and organization by treatment. Pupils for whom special materials or organizations were identified were listed. No consistent relationships were observable across the grades between treatment and final achievement.

Tables D and E present summary tabulations by grade of numbers of pupils reported for each type of treatment and combination of treatments. Pupils categorized as "Other Treatment" are those for whom that category was signified or those for whom no treatment category was indicated.

Teachers reported that 2242 pupils, grades 1-6, received reading instruction from a reading specialist, while 4579 of their classmates remained for instruction from their classroom teacher. More than 21,000 pupils received instruction in a classroom in which all were instructed by the regular teacher. In all, more than 26,000 pupils received their reading instruction from a classroom teacher. Aides served in classrooms in which more than 10,000 ESEA children received their reading instruction, while in excess of 18,000 were in classrooms not served by aides.

Counts of pupils by types of materials and organization (Table F) revealed nearly 4600 for whom Sullivan Readers were the principal instructional materials. "Language Experience" was reported for 531; however, it is uncertain whether that was the principal method of instruction for 123 upper graders. Almost 200 pupils received instruction based on the Initial Teaching Alphabet (ita). Not reported was the vast majority of pupils, for whom the principal instructional method was one of the traditional basal reading methods.

Ungraded organizations were reported for more than 1000 pupils, while 2038 first graders and 1153 second graders were on a divided day schedule. Reports of divided day programs for pupils above the second grade probably were in error.

The median time reported for reading instruction at all grade levels was approximately 90 minutes; the range, from less than 30 to more than 240 minutes. Two

major problems cloud analysis of data concerning achievement by time or interpretation of time: (1) Not all schools used the same criteria for defining the length of the instructional period for reading (e.g., some included spelling, writing, etc.); (2) Teachers had been instructed by administrators at various levels that reading periods were to be of 90 minutes' duration; consequently, even when their actual instructional time varied, there may have been a tendency to report the approved time.

A summary of reading grade equivalents and gains by grade and area at each testing is presented in Table G. The gap between pupils' achievement and their expected grade equivalent showed an annual increase, except between the third and fourth grades. The greatest gain occurred at the fourth grade--one year in seven months of instruction. Table H lists the pre and post grade equivalents and gains by grade and school within each administrative area. Grade one scores are reported in percentiles for the pretest (readiness) and by grade equivalent for the posttest (achievement).

A multilevel program of inservice education was conducted to assist participants in the attainment of the objective. Monthly sessions were conducted by Area personnel for resource teachers, consultants, and reading specialists. In some cases special demonstrations were arranged for groups of personnel with particular needs or interests. Local inservice sessions were conducted to disseminate information gained in Area meetings. Additionally, each school had its own pattern of inservice training, drawing on outside resources, as well as on local school and Area personnel. These were further supplemented at each school by grade level meetings and/or workshops. Stressed at all levels were the use and preparation of materials, instructional techniques, methods of individualizing instruction, diagnosis and remediation of reading problems, and the effects of different cultural backgrounds and poverty on children.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Although patterns of attainment varied widely from school to school, it appeared that, for the project schools as a whole, the objective was achieved.

Conversely, it still is evident that, for the pupils in ESEA schools, the deficit from grade level increased with each succeeding year, reaching -1.5 years at the fifth grade level and -2.1 years at the sixth.

Until further detailed analysis of the data is completed, concomitants of successful or unsuccessful programs can not be identified.

Perhaps the most notable weakness is in the lack of operational definitions for the various kinds of organization and treatment variables; accurate descriptions are prerequisite to meaningful evaluation.

Other weaknesses, as identified by participant schools, included insufficient lead time in planning and orientation; lack of enough inservice for special reading teachers, with emphasis on "laboratory" (prescriptive) techniques and in individualization of instruction; insufficient supplies of materials for prescriptive teaching; lack of informal instruments for diagnostic testing; and not enough availability of professional literature.

TABLE A

READING TESTS, TESTING COMPLETION DATES, AND MONTHS BETWEEN PRE- AND POSTTESTS

GRADE	PRETEST	COMPLETION DATE	POSTTEST	COMPLETION DATE	MONTHS BETWEEN PRE-POST
1	Metropolitan Readiness Tests Form B	10/31/69	Cooperative Primary Test Reading, Form 12A	5/22/70	7
2	Stanford Achievement Test Reading, Form W, Level I	5/30/69	Stanford Achievement Test Reading, Form W, Level II	5/22/70	10
3	Stanford Achievement Test Reading, Form W, Level II	5/30/69	Stanford Achievement Test Reading, Form X, Level II	5/22/70	10
4	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) Reading, Form R, Level 2	10/31/69	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) Reading, Form R, Level 2	5/27/70	7
5	CTBS Reading, Form R, Level 2	10/31/69	CTBS Reading, Form R, Level 2	5/27/70	7
6	CTBS Reading, Form Q, Level 2	11/26/69	CTBS Reading, Form R, Level 2	5/27/70	6

TABLE B

GRADE EQUIVALENTS, GAINS, AND PERCENTILES FOR READING MEANS VS. MEDIANS

GRADE		PRE	GE	%ILE	POST	GE	%ILE	MONTHS BETWEEN TESTS	GAIN	YEARS BELOW GRADE LEVEL
1	MEAN	46.3	---	33	23.4	1.8	51	7	---	-0.1
	MDN.	47.3	---	35	21.5	1.7	41	7	---	-0.2
2	MEAN	26.7	1.6	14	35.8	2.4	26	10	0.8	-0.5
	MDN.	23.4	1.5	8	30.6	2.1	14	10	0.6	-0.8
3	MEAN	27.8	2.0	10	48.6	2.8	14	10	0.8	-1.1
	MDN.	24.4	1.9	6	47.9	2.8	14	10	0.9	-1.1
4 M	MEAN	20.8	3.0	23	32.9	4.1	36	7	1.1	-0.8
	MDN.	20.1	2.9	21	28.6	3.8	30	7	0.9	-1.1
UNM	MEAN	20.6	3.0	22	32.0	4.0	35	7	1.0	-0.9
	MDN.	19.9	2.9	20	27.5	3.6	28	7	0.7	-1.3
5 M	MEAN	26.1	3.5	20	37.8	4.4	26	7	0.9	-1.5
	MDN.	23.8	3.3	16	34.5	4.1	23	7	0.8	-1.8
UNM	MEAN	25.8	3.5	20	36.9	4.3	26	7	0.8	-1.6
	MDN.	23.6	3.3	16	33.1	4.1	21	7	0.8	-1.8
6 M	MEAN	38.4	3.9	16	43.8	4.8	22	6	0.9	-2.1
	MDN.	35.9	3.8	14	42.4	4.7	20	6	0.9	-2.2
UNM	MEAN	38.1	3.9	15	43.1	4.7	21	6	0.8	-2.2
	MDN.	35.6	3.8	14	41.2	4.6	19	6	0.8	-2.3

M = Matched; UNM = Unmatched.

TABLE C-1

MINUTES, MATERIALS, ORGANIZATION, AND PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS BY TREATMENT
GRADE 1

TREATMENT CODE	N	MINUTES MEDIAN	MATERIALS CODE	N	ORGANIZATION CODE	N	PRETEST METRO MEAN	PRETEST METRO %ILE	POSTTEST COOP MEAN	POSTTEST COOP %ILE
1	404	90	1	141	2	135	43.6	28	23.2	50
			2	12						
			6	3						
3	715	90	1	254	2	290	47.4	35	21.9	43
4	449	89	1	108	2	194	45.4	32	27.0	69
			2	16						
			6	3						
5	1302	90	1	258	1	1	47.7	36	22.0	44
			6	166	2	319				
6	1358	90	1	101	1	11	46.9	35	23.3	51
			2	104	2	772				
			3	17						
			4	6						
			6	31						
8	623	89	1	101	1	17	42.9	27	25.7	63
			2	20	2	328				
			4	12						
			6	187						
TOTALS		90	1	963	1	29	46.3	33	23.4	51
N = 4851			2	152	2	2038				
			3	17						
			4	18						
			6	390						

Treatment Code:
1 - Reading Specialist With Aide
3 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, With Aide
4 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, Without Aide
5 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, With Aide
6 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, Without Aide
8 - Other Treatment

Materials Code:
1 - Sullivan
2 - ita
3 - SWRL
4 - Miami Linguistic
5 - Reading Pacemakers
6 - Language Experience

Organization Code: 1 - Ungraded 2 - Divided Day

TABLE C-2

MINUTES, MATERIALS, ORGANIZATION, AND PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS BY TREATMENT
GRADE 2

TREATMENT		MINUTES	MATERIALS		ORGANIZATION		PRETEST STANFORD			POSTTEST STANFORD		
CODE	N	MEDIAN	CODE	N	CODE	N	MEAN	%ILE	GE	MEAN	%ILE	GE
1	377	90	1	83	2	156	23.3	8	1.5	32.9	20	2.2
			2	1								
			6	2								
3	579	90	1	156	2	144	25.5	8	1.5	33.5	23	2.3
4	495	90	1	61	2	244	28.4	14	1.6	39.7	32	2.5
			6	9								
5	822	90	1	241	1	11	23.5	8	1.5	31.6	20	2.2
					2	157						
6	609	90	1	85	1	9	25.5	8	1.5	32.3	20	2.2
			2	36	2	393						
8	296	90	1	57	1	15	24.9	8	1.5	28.9	10	2.0
			6	2	2	59						
TOTALS		90	1	683	1	35	26.7	14	1.6	35.8	26	2.4
N = 3178			2	37	2	1153						
			6	13								

Treatment Code: 1 - Reading Specialist With Aide
3 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, With Aide
4 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, Without Aide
5 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, With Aide
6 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, Without Aide
8 - Other Treatment

Materials Code: 1 - Sullivan 3 - SWRL 5 - Reading Pacemakers
2 - ita 4 - Miami Linguistic 6 - Language Experience

Organization Code: 1 - Ungraded 2 - Divided Day

TABLE C-3

MINUTES, MATERIALS, ORGANIZATION, AND PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEANS BY TREATMENT
GRADE 3

TREATMENT CODE	N	MINUTES MEDIAN	MATERIALS CODE	N	ORGANIZATION CODE	N	PRETEST STANFORD MEAN	%ILE	GE	POSTTEST STANFORD MEAN	%ILE	GE
1	368	90	1	45	----		24.1	6	1.9	44.7	12	2.7
3	489	90	1 6	116 5	----		29.1	10	2.0	48.5	14	2.8
4	521	90	1	23	----		28.1	10	2.0	50.2	16	2.9
5	753	90	1	214	1 2	14 2	23.9	6	1.9	49.5	16	2.9
6	696	98	1	49	1 2	6 2	28.6	10	2.0	49.1	14	2.8
8	405	90	1	38	1	5	29.8	14	2.1	48.0	14	2.8
TOTALS N = 3232		90	1 6	485 5	1 2	25 4	27.8	10	2.0	48.6	14	2.8

Treatment Code:
1 - Reading Specialist With Aide
3 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, With Aide
4 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, Without Aide
5 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, With Aide
6 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, Without Aide
8 - Other Treatment

Materials Code:
1 - Sullivan
2 - ita
3 - SWRL
4 - Miami Linguistic
5 - Reading Pacemakers
6 - Language Experience

Organization Code:
1 - Ungraded
2 - Divided Day

TABLE D

NUMBER OF PUPILS BY GRADE AND TYPE OF INSTRUCTIONAL TREATMENT

	GRADE						
CODE	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
1	*	*	*	75	121	17	213
2	404	377	368	388	234	258	2029
3	715	579	489	112	118	41	2054
4	449	495	521	500	379	181	2525
5	1302	822	753	1695	1420	1776	7768
6	1358	609	696	3747	3959	3300	13669
7	*	*	*	377	228	239	844
8	623	296	405	57	67	33	1481

* Data not available for Treatments 1 and 7, Grades 1, 2, and 3.

Treatment Code:
1 - Reading Specialist With Aide
2 - Reading Specialist Without Aide
3 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, With Aide
4 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, Without Aide
5 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, With Aide
6 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, Without Aide
7 - Teacher Specialist Team
8 - Other Treatment

TABLE E

NUMBER OF PUPILS BY SELECTED COMBINATIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL TREATMENT

CODE	GRADE 1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
1,2	404*	377*	368*	463	355	275	2242
3,4	1164	1074	1010	612	497	222	4579
5,6	2660	1431	1449	5442	5379	5076	21437
3,4,5,6	3824	2505	2459	6054	5876	5296	26016
1,3,5	2017*	1401*	1242*	1882	1659	1834	10035
2,4,6	2211	1481	1585	4635	4572	3739	18223
7,8	623*	296*	405*	434	295	272	2325

* Data not available for Treatments 1 and 7, Grades 1, 2, and 3.

Treatment Code:
1 - Reading Specialist With Aide
2 - Reading Specialist Without Aide
3 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, With Aide
4 - Regular Teacher of Remaining Group, Without Aide
5 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, With Aide
6 - Regular Teacher of Entire Class, Without Aide
7 - Teacher Specialist Team
8 - Other Treatment

TABLE F

PUPILS REPORTED FOR TYPES OF MATERIALS AND ORGANIZATION

CODE - MATERIALS	GRADE 1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
1 - Sullivan	963	683	485	927	796	736	4590
2 - ita	152	37	--	--	8	--	197
3 - SWRL	17	--	--	--	--	--	17
4 - Miami Linguistic	18	--	--	8	10	1	37
5 - Reading Pacemakers	--	--	--	--	--	7	7
6 - Language Experience	390	13	5	1	88	34	531

CODE - ORGANIZATION	GRADE 1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
1 - Ungraded	29	35	25	312	327	337	1065
2 - Divided Day	2038	1153	4	25	--	58	3278

TABLE G

GRADE EQUIVALENTS AND GAINS IN READING BY GRADE AND ADMINISTRATIVE AREA[a]

GRADE	ALL SCHOOLS PRE GE	ALL SCHOOLS POST GE	ALL SCHOOLS GAIN	AREA EAST PRE GE	AREA EAST POST GE	AREA EAST GAIN	AREA NORTH PRE GE	AREA NORTH POST GE	AREA NORTH GAIN	AREA SOUTH PRE GE	AREA SOUTH POST GE	AREA SOUTH GAIN	MONTHS BETWEEN TESTS	EXPECTED GE AT TIME OF POSTTEST
1[b]	---	1.8	---	---	1.7	---	---	1.8	---	---	1.8	---	7	1.9
2[c]	1.5	2.1	0.6	1.5	2.0	0.5	1.5	2.5	1.0	1.5	2.3	0.8	10	2.9
3[c]	1.9	2.8	0.9	1.9	2.7	0.8	2.0	2.9	0.9	1.9	2.6	0.7	10	3.9
4[d]	3.0	4.0	1.0	3.0	3.8	0.8	2.9	4.3	1.4	2.9	3.9	1.0	7	4.9
5[d]	3.5	4.3	0.8	3.6	4.2	0.6	3.5	4.5	1.0	3.4	4.2	0.8	7	5.9
6[d]	3.9	4.7	0.8	4.1	4.6	0.5	3.8	4.9	1.1	3.8	4.7	0.9	6	6.9

a - All figures based on mean raw scores.
b - No grade equivalents published for first-grade pretest.
c - Matched pupils.
d - Unmatched pupils.

TABLE H

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
EAST	Belvedere	1	112	35*	156	1.7	-
		2	68	1.5	136	2.5	1.0
		3	81	2.0	139	2.7	0.7
		4	130	3.4	133	3.9	0.5
		5	114	3.9	120	4.3	0.4
		6	128	4.1	132	4.6	0.5
	Breed	1	85	27*	85	2.3	-
		2	65	1.8	63	2.7	0.9
		3	41	2.0	56	3.5	1.5
		4	55	3.0	52	3.9	0.9
		5	59	3.8	61	4.7	0.8**
		6	63	4.3	59	4.9	0.6
	Bridge	1	55	31*	63	1.7	-
		2	39	1.5	40	2.6	1.1
		3	38	1.8	42	2.7	0.9
		4	35	3.0	34	3.7	0.7
		5	59	3.5	60	4.5	1.0
		6	36	3.8	36	4.3	0.5
	Dacotah	1	134	41*	126	1.8	-
		2	132	1.6	147	2.4	0.8
		3	118	1.9	129	2.7	0.8
		4	104	3.5	92	4.0	0.6**
		5	94	3.4	92	4.4	1.0
		6	64	3.8	71	4.8	1.0
	Eastman	1	178	20*	166	1.6	-
		2	110	1.5	172	2.3	0.8
		3	117	2.2	228	3.0	0.8
		4	161	3.0	177	3.9	0.9
		5	176	3.7	187	4.2	0.6**
		6	160	4.1	151	4.7	0.6
	Euclid	1	126	29*	137	1.7	-
		2	94	1.6	135	2.1	0.5
		3	81	2.2	138	2.8	0.6
		4	116	2.8	119	3.5	0.6**
		5	120	3.4	117	4.4	1.0
		6	102	4.0	106	4.7	0.7

*Percentile Equivalent

**See explanatory note at end of table.

G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

TABLE H (Cont.)

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
EAST	Evergreen	1	143	37*	136	1.7	-
		2	155	1.4	147	1.9	0.5
		3	132	1.8	135	2.7	0.9
		4	91	2.9	117	3.9	1.0
		5	101	3.8	118	4.2	0.5**
		6	107	4.1	111	4.6	0.5
	Ford	1	175	31*	177	1.7	-
		2	111	1.5	151	2.1	0.6
		3	106	1.8	167	2.6	0.8
		4	171	3.1	175	4.1	0.9**
		5	160	3.4	176	4.0	0.6
		6	135	4.1	135	4.7	0.6
	Hammel	1	174	41*	161	1.6	-
		2	113	1.5	152	1.9	0.4
		3	73	1.9	124	2.4	0.5
		4	107	2.9	110	3.4	0.6**
		5	157	3.4	153	3.9	0.5
		6	126	4.0	125	4.5	0.5
	Harrison	1	145	52*	145	1.5	-
		2	88	1.6	123	1.9	0.3
		3	103	1.8	98	2.7	0.9
		4	100	2.9	102	3.7	0.7**
		5	105	4.0	111	4.6	0.5**
		6	109	4.3	103	5.1	0.8
	Malabar	1	163	28*	181	1.7	-
		2	93	1.6	173	2.2	0.6
		3	112	2.1	180	2.6	0.5
		4	171	3.1	184	3.8	0.7
		5	134	3.9	136	4.5	0.6
		6	155	4.3	159	4.8	0.5
	Marianna	1	64	34*	55	1.9	-
		2	55	1.5	65	2.1	0.6
		3	50	2.1	73	2.7	0.6
		4	72	3.0	63	3.6	0.6
		5	45	4.0	49	4.4	0.4
		6	44	3.8	41	4.3	0.5

*Percentile Equivalent
**See explanatory note at end of table.
G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

TABLE H (Cont.)

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
EAST	Rowan	1	191	2.6*	171	1.9	-
		2	95	1.6	178	2.5	0.9
		3	124	1.9	176	2.6	0.7
		4	162	2.6	178	3.5	0.9
		5	170	3.5	170	4.1	0.6
		6	141	4.0	136	4.6	0.5**
	Second	1	102	23*	120	1.3	-
		2	55	1.5	91	1.9	0.4
		3	61	1.7	111	2.4	0.7
		4	93	2.7	109	3.5	0.8**
		5	99	3.0	99	3.6	0.7**
		6	107	3.8	119	4.3	0.5
	Sheridan	1	154	27*	144	1.5	-
		2	153	1.4	151	1.9	0.5
		3	106	1.9	127	2.7	0.8
		4	119	3.2	135	3.9	0.7
		5	140	3.5	130	4.1	0.6
		6	136	4.2	145	4.7	0.5
	Soto	1	42	37*	51	1.9	-
		2	44	1.6	47	2.5	0.9
		3	33	2.2	37	2.9	0.7
		4	35	3.0	34	3.7	0.7
		5	45	3.7	48	4.4	0.8**
		6	36	4.3	41	4.9	0.6
	Utah	1	174	16*	179	1.8	-
		2	105	1.5	141	2.1	0.6**
		3	138	1.8	152	2.2	0.4
		4	127	2.9	131	3.3	0.4
		5	114	3.4	119	3.7	0.4**
		6	99	3.5	101	4.1	0.6

*Percentile Equivalent
**See explanatory note at end of table.
G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

TABLE H (Cont.)

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
NORTH	Ann	1	114	74*	103	2.5	-
		2	49	1.6	86	2.9	1.3
		3	3	1.7	6	3.8	2.1
		4	52	2.9	45	4.8	2.0**
		5	43	3.5	43	5.5	2.0
		6	42	3.6	43	5.7	2.1
	Cortez	1	170	21*	143	1.9	-
		2	100	1.5	124	2.5	1.0
		3	88	2.0	158	2.9	0.9
		4	138	2.9	141	5.7	2.8
		5	111	3.6	123	6.7	3.0**
		6	135	4.1	143	7.2	3.1
	52nd St.	1	190	36*	193	1.7	-
		2	197	1.5	211	2.3	0.8
		3	117	2.1	156	2.8	0.7
		4	177	3.4	199	4.3	0.9
		5	145	3.7	157	4.5	0.8
		6	135	4.2	162	6.0	1.9**
	49th St.	1	116	20*	103	2.1	-
		2	62	1.6	118	2.6	1.0
		3	51	2.0	125	2.6	0.6
		4	91	2.4	100	6.1	3.7
		5	97	3.4	114	5.3	1.9
		6	83	3.6	83	4.5	0.9
	Holmes	1	87	32*	70	2.7	-
		2	52	1.5	101	3.5	2.0
		3	37	1.8	71	4.0	2.2
		4	64	3.0	68	5.8	2.7**
		5	63	3.6	65	5.4	1.7**
		6	74	3.7	78	5.7	2.0
	Hooper	1	204	26*	201	1.8	-
		2	153	1.6	197	2.2	0.6
		3	185	2.3	206	2.6	0.3
		4	124	2.7	151	3.9	1.2
		5	166	3.3	156	4.2	0.9**
		6	149	3.7	158	4.5	0.8

*Percentile Equivalent
**See explanatory note at end of table.
G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

TABLE H (Cont.)

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
NORTH	Lillian	1	89	16*	61	2.2	-
		2	69	1.5	53	2.7	1.2
		3	67	2.0	73	3.3	1.3
		4	66	3.1	62	4.1	1.0
		5	64	3.6	67	4.8	1.2
		6	53	4.5	57	5.6	1.2**
	Main	1	190	28*	167	1.8	-
		2	90	1.6	161	2.4	0.8
		3	71	2.1	142	3.0	0.9
		4	144	3.0	140	3.9	1.0**
		5	129	3.6	140	4.2	0.6
		6	139	4.0	146	4.6	0.6
	Miramonte	1	185	32*	178	1.8	-
		2	126	1.5	204	2.3	0.8
		3	147	1.8	197	2.9	1.1
		4	175	3.1	179	3.6	0.6**
		5	172	3.5	186	4.1	0.6
		6	121	3.8	143	4.6	0.8
	Nevin	1	59	26*	56	2.0	-
		2	54	1.6	73	2.5	0.9
		3	53	2.3	61	3.7	1.4
		4	61	2.5	61	4.6	2.2**
		5	57	3.2	54	4.5	1.4**
		6	57	3.6	56	6.0	2.4
	68th St.	1	140	27*	145	1.7	-
		2	111	1.5	153	2.5	1.0
		3	105	2.2	143	2.6	0.4
		4	147	3.0	143	3.8	0.8
		5	156	3.5	142	4.1	0.6
		6	115	3.8	127	4.4	0.6
	61st St.	1	154	21*	135	1.5	-
		2	124	1.5	137	2.0	0.5
		3	102	1.8	115	2.5	0.7
		4	110	3.0	120	3.7	0.7
		5	104	3.4	125	4.3	0.9
		6	108	4.0	117	4.5	0.5

*Percentile Equivalent
**See explanatory note at end of table.
G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

TABLE H (Cont.)

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
NORTH	66th St.	1	143	29*	135	1.9	-
		2	94	1.5	134	2.6	1.1
		3	129	2.1	146	3.5	1.4
		4	129	3.1	136	4.6	1.4**
		5	160	3.6	151	4.5	0.9
		6	123	4.0	126	4.9	1.0**
	Trinity	1	146	20*	131	2.0	-
		2	81	1.6	120	2.4	0.8
		3	82	2.2	111	3.0	0.8
		4	101	2.6	86	4.2	1.6
		5	101	3.1	105	4.0	0.9
		6	86	3.9	88	4.3	0.4
	20th St.	1	40	57*	53	2.5	-
		2	15	1.4	48	2.3	0.9
		3	21	1.9	42	2.7	0.8
		4	52	3.0	43	3.5	0.5
		5	52	3.5	43	4.7	1.2
		6	46	3.8	49	4.5	0.7
	28th St.	1	140	24*	116	2.2	-
		2	86	1.4	136	3.4	2.0
		3	8	1.6	90	3.2	1.6
		4	108	2.9	99	5.8	2.9
		5	89	3.4	89	6.4	3.0
		6	66	3.8	83	5.0	1.2
	Wadsworth	1	145	36*	130	1.8	-
		2	108	1.4	148	2.3	0.9
		3	122	1.9	138	2.8	0.9
		4	135	2.6	137	3.6	1.0
		5	116	3.4	126	3.9	0.5
		6	92	3.7	99	4.3	0.6

*Percentile Equivalent
**See explanatory note at end of table.
G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

TABLE H (Cont.)

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
SOUTH	Compton	1	66	51*	75	1.7	-
		2	59	1.4	69	1.9	0.5
		3	46	2.0	74	2.5	0.5
		4	51	3.1	59	3.5	0.4
		5	64	3.4	68	4.1	0.7
		6	72	3.8	71	4.3	0.5
	Graham	1	132	27*	140	2.2	-
		2	86	1.6	139	2.6	1.0
		3	81	2.4	143	2.7	0.3
		4	141	3.3	139	4.1	0.8
		5	127	3.7	118	4.3	0.6
		6	113	4.1	115	4.6	0.5
	Grape	1	121	38*	133	1.8	-
		2	140	1.5	140	2.0	0.5
		3	107	2.3	132	2.5	0.2
		4	112	2.5	110	3.8	1.2**
		5	95	3.1	93	4.0	0.8**
		6	66	3.8	69	4.5	0.7
	95th St.	1	284	33*	251	1.7	-
		2	105	1.5	205	2.3	0.8
		3	101	1.9	180	2.7	0.8
		4	174	2.8	163	3.8	1.0
		5	149	3.2	145	4.0	0.8
		6	136	3.8	152	4.5	0.7
	99th St.	1	132	19*	89	1.8	-
		2	40	1.5	100	2.7	1.2
		3	60	2.0	93	2.8	0.8
		4	88	3.0	105	3.4	0.4
		5	99	3.6	106	4.3	0.7
		6	75	4.2	82	4.7	0.5
	97th St.	1	121	33*	152	1.5	-
		2	40	1.5	100	2.7	1.2
		3	73	1.9	137	2.5	0.6
		4	169	2.8	162	3.8	1.1**
		5	142	3.1	131	4.1	1.0
		6	170	3.8	163	4.9	1.1

*Percentile Equivalent
**See explanatory note at end of table.
G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

TABLE H (Cont.)

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
SOUTH	96th St.	1	113	27*	108	2.0	-
		2	58	1.5	115	2.0	0.5
		3	57	1.7	117	2.3	0.6
		4	95	2.9	99	3.7	0.7**
		5	88	3.4	101	4.3	0.9
		6	88	3.6	94	5.0	1.4
	111th St.	1	138	46*	134	1.8	-
		2	112	1.4	130	2.8	1.4
		3	99	2.2	159	2.7	0.5
		4	143	2.8	136	4.0	1.2
		5	118	3.4	106	5.1	1.7
		6	108	3.7	109	5.3	1.6
	109th St.	1	97	27*	75	2.0	-
		2	51	1.4	64	2.0	0.6
		3	57	1.8	75	2.5	0.7
		4	70	3.0	70	3.6	0.6
		5	51	3.3	57	4.0	0.7
		6	69	3.6	70	5.0	1.4
	102nd St.	1	133	36*	137	2.0	-
		2	97	1.5	168	1.9	0.4
		3	110	1.8	171	2.5	0.7
		4	128	2.9	123	3.4	0.5
		5	133	3.3	125	4.1	0.8
		6	116	3.6	116	4.3	0.7
	107th St.	1	177	33*	172	1.8	-
		2	104	1.5	195	2.4	0.9
		3	80	1.8	191	2.9	1.1
		4	159	2.9	158	3.9	1.0
		5	147	3.4	146	3.9	0.5
		6	116	3.9	129	4.5	0.6
	Parmelee	1	162	34*	168	1.7	-
		2	85	1.5	126	2.0	0.5
		3	79	1.8	140	2.9	1.1
		4	169	3.0	147	5.6	2.6
		5	157	3.4	139	5.4	2.0
		6	145	3.8	132	5.7	1.9

*Percentile Equivalent
**See explanatory note at end of table.
G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

TABLE H (Cont.)

READING TEST RESULTS - GRADES 1-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
SOUTH	Ritter	1	55	53*	41	1.9	-
		2	36	1.6	38	1.9	0.3
		3	28	2.0	43	2.5	0.5
		4	32	3.2	37	3.4	0.2
		5	51	3.7	49	4.0	0.3
		6	36	3.6	46	4.0	0.4
	Russell	1	128	32*	143	1.9	-
		2	85	1.6	149	2.5	0.9
		3	80	2.0	140	2.8	0.8
		4	160	3.1	161	4.2	1.1
		5	130	3.4	132	4.0	0.6
		6	143	3.6	144	4.5	0.9
	75th St.	1	209	48*	213	1.5	-
		2	123	1.5	249	2.1	0.6
		3	139	1.8	236	2.4	0.6
		4	205	2.8	202	3.4	0.6
		5	193	3.6	176	4.1	0.5
		6	145	4.1	187	4.6	0.5
	South Park	1	138	29*	150	1.8	-
		2	90	1.5	163	2.0	0.5
		3	83	2.4	127	2.7	0.3
		4	153	2.9	145	3.5	0.7**
		5	141	3.5	127	3.9	0.4
		6	135	4.0	132	4.7	0.6**

*Percentile Equivalent

**Note: Apparent discrepancies in gain scores (e.g., 4.0 to 4.7 shows a gain of 0.8) are not in error but the result of their computation prior to rounding off the G.E. scores for reporting.

G.E. (Grade Equivalent) is based on MEAN raw score.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: MATHEMATICS

Abstract

Pupils	45,000
Schools	55
Teachers	66
Approximate Cost	$1,216,401

Description: In the mathematics component each school was encouraged to develop innovative approaches which best would meet the needs of its pupils. The following information, therefore, serves as a generalized description of the program without specific reference to the variations within the 55 participating ESEA schools.

The component, serving almost 45,000 pupils, grades one through six, provided the services of a special mathematics teacher. This person, whose duties varied from working almost full time with pupils to serving only teachers, was called a "consultant" in some schools and a "specialist" in others.

Specialists in music, art, and physical education incorporated mathematics concepts and skills in their respective subject areas and helped regular teachers to individualize instruction by lowering class size. Also, education aides assisted teachers in most schools. A total of 66 full-time positions served the mathematics component in the 55 schools.

In some schools specialist teachers used the "pull-out" method to teach pupils in greatest need of help while the regular teacher worked with the remainder of the class. In others they engaged in team-teaching or taught demonstration lessons, some daily, some twice weekly. In a few schools certain teachers paired up to departmentalize mathematics and reading instruction with their two classes - one teaching mathematics to both classes, the other teaching reading.

Time Intervals: The component operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970, and was continued for some pupils during the summer sessions.

Activities: Instruction was provided on an individual basis and in small groups. Diagnostic tests, materials from the Madison Mathematics Project, programmed workbooks, basic and supplemental textbooks, and teacher-made learning materials were utilized. Concrete and manipulative materials such as abaci, Cuisenaire rods, and geoboards were used in independent activities. Pupils learned basic mathematics facts, measurement principles, problem solving, money and time concepts, and discovery methods.

Grade-level meetings, workshops, and inservice classes were scheduled regularly throughout the year to develop instructional materials, strengthen teaching skills, and increase effectiveness in the use of curriculum materials. Area consultants assisted teachers in experimenting with new techniques and in interpreting test data.

Objective:

- To improve classroom performance in other skill areas (mathematics) beyond usual expectations
  To raise the median gain of project participants in mathematics by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests

Evaluation Strategy: Pre- and posttests were used to measure achievement in mathematics of all pupils in grades three through six in the target schools and in six comparison schools. Third graders took the Cooperative Primary Test, while fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade pupils were tested with the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills.

Results: For the Title I schools as a group the mathematics component achieved its objective of one year's growth in one year's time. The third grade demonstrated a gain of 14 percentiles relative to the norming population between the pre- and posttest periods.

The greatest gain occurred in the fourth grade (1.2 grade levels in 7 months), with the fifth grade also exceeding the objective. The sixth grade group equaled the objective. It must be noted, however, that even though the project objectives were met or exceeded relative to the national norming population, decrements from mean grade placement ranged from just less than one year at the fourth grade level to just less than two years at the sixth. This decrement was just under one and one-half years at the fifth grade level.

The areas differ not more than two months (0.2) from the District average, with Area East schools showing less gain at the fifth- and sixth-grade levels than the other areas. However, the final grade placements were identical to those of Area North, whose schools made the greatest gains. Although Area South schools started and ended with the lowest grade placements, they succeeded in lessening the gap between their pupils and those in the other areas at the fifth- and sixth-grade levels.

Conclusions: Title I pupils either achieved or exceeded the stated objective for the mathematics activity. The decrement from grade level was lessened at the third, fourth, and fifth grades generally.

Recommendations: The mathematics activity should be continued.

Where priorities permit, the activity should be expanded in an effort to decrease the pupils' decrements from grade level.

MATHEMATICS

Detailed Report

Evaluation of the Mathematics component was directed at assessment of achievement and improvement in mean grade placements in grades three through six. New tests were used at the third grade (Cooperative Primary Test, Form 23A) and the upper three grades (Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - CTBS).

Objective: To improve classroom performance in other skill areas (mathematics) beyond usual expectations.
To raise the median gain of project participants in mathematics by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests.

Results showed that the objective was met or exceeded for each of the upper three grades. No grade level equivalents were available for the Cooperative Primary Test used at the third grade. Third-grade progress was indicated by a gain of 14 percentiles in reference to fall (pre) and spring (post) norms for the two testing periods.

Although the upper three grades gained one month or more per month of instruction, each grade remained well below its expected grade level placement: -8 months at the fourth grade, -1.3 years at fifth, and -1.7 years at sixth grade. The results of the pre- and posttests with grade equivalents for each area and for all Title I schools are displayed in Table A. All areas showed about the same gains in fourth grade, but in the fifth and sixth grades Area East fell behind the other areas--though still meeting the objective as to amount of gain at the fifth grade. Sixth graders in Area East fell just short of the amount of growth stated in the objective.

Results by grade and school within each area are presented as Table B.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The overall strength of the component was indicated by the results which showed pupils at the fourth and fifth grades exceeding the objective of one month gain per month of instruction, and the sixth grade equaling it.

Although their tests were not directly interpretable in terms of grade placement, the third-grade group climbed from the 13th to the 27th percentile during the school year, indicating that they made greater than the expected gain.

On the negative side, all groups remain below the national averages--but then, half of the schools in the country are also in that condition.

Efforts to specify treatments and to identify in more concrete terms the way in which the mathematics program affects each child need to be continued and expanded.

TABLE A

MATHEMATICS TEST RESULTS - GRADES 4-6

Unmatched Scores

AREA	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.*	POST N_2	POST G.E.*	GAIN	ELAPSED MONTHS
East	4	1696	3.0	1894	4.1	1.1	7
	5	1784	3.9	1890	4.6	0.7	7
	6	1697	4.7	1744	5.2	0.5	6
North	4	1709	2.9	1823	4.1	1.2	7
	5	1751	3.5	1847	4.6	1.1	7
	6	1568	4.4	1714	5.2	0.8	6
South	4	1873	2.7	1925	3.7	1.0	7
	5	1739	3.4	1749	4.4	1.0	7
	6	1600	4.2	1726	4.9	0.7	6
District	3	5149	13%ile	5149	27%ile	---	-
	4	5278	2.8	5647	4.0	1.2	7
	5	5274	3.6	5486	4.5	0.9	7
	6	4865	4.5	5184	5.1	0.6	6

*Grade equivalent (G.E.) is based on mean raw score.

TABLE B

MATHEMATICS TEST RESULTS - GRADES 4-6

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.*	POST N_2	POST G.E.*	GAIN
EAST	Belvedere	4	124	3.0	134	4.2	1.2
		5	107	4.1	119	4.6	0.5
		6	118	4.7	126	5.2	0.5
	Breed	4	51	3.0	50	4.2	1.2
		5	58	4.1	61	5.1	1.0
		6	59	5.0	59	5.5	0.5
	Bridge	4	33	3.0	35	3.9	0.9
		5	54	3.8	59	4.9	1.1
		6	32	4.5	37	5.0	0.5
	Dacotah	4	120	3.2	111	4.2	1.0
		5	89	3.8	87	4.9	1.1
		6	67	4.4	71	4.9	0.5
	Eastman	4	154	2.9	176	4.1	1.2
		5	130	4.1	184	4.8	0.7
		6	158	4.6	153	5.2	0.5**
	Euclid	4	67	3.0	94	4.0	1.0
		5	122	3.9	118	4.9	1.0
		6	104	4.9	105	5.8	0.9
	Evergreen	4	70	2.4	115	3.9	1.5
		5	98	3.8	118	4.4	0.6
		6	109	4.6	112	5.0	0.4
	Ford	4	160	3.3	169	4.5	1.2
		5	158	3.9	176	4.5	0.6
		6	135	4.7	134	5.3	0.6
	Hammel	4	109	2.8	98	3.5	0.7
		5	159	3.8	145	4.4	0.6
		6	120	4.6	122	4.8	0.2
	Harrison	4	100	3.0	108	3.9	0.9
		5	108	4.1	108	4.6	0.5
		6	110	4.7	98	5.2	0.5
	Malabar	4	160	3.0	188	4.1	1.1
		5	131	4.2	138	4.9	0.7
		6	157	4.9	162	5.5	0.6
	Marianna	4	69	2.9	54	3.7	0.8
		5	46	4.2	37	5.0	0.8
		6	43	4.7	39	5.0	0.3

*Grade equivalent (G.E.) is based on mean raw score.
**See explanatory note at end of table.

TABLE B (Cont.)

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.*	POST N_2	POST G.E.*	GAIN
EAST	Rowan	4	162	3.0	177	4.2	1.2
		5	169	3.9	167	4.9	1.0
		6	139	4.6	136	5.5	0.9
	Second	4	85	2.6	106	3.6	1.0
		5	83	3.2	89	4.0	0.8
		6	98	4.5	120	5.0	0.4**
	Sheridan	4	90	2.9	128	4.2	1.3
		5	120	3.4	125	4.5	1.1
		6	129	4.7	137	5.4	0.7
	Soto	4	31	2.4	33	3.9	1.5
		5	45	3.6	49	4.7	1.1
		6	34	4.8	38	5.4	0.6
	Utah	4	111	2.7	118	3.2	0.5
		5	107	3.4	109	3.9	0.5
		6	85	4.1	95	4.6	0.5
NORTH	Ann	4	31	2.3	45	4.0	1.7
		5	34	4.0	40	4.8	0.9**
		6	39	4.6	42	4.9	0.3
	Cortez	4	126	2.9	137	4.6	1.7
		5	112	3.9	123	5.2	1.3
		6	135	4.7	143	6.2	1.4**
	52nd St.	4	170	3.0	192	4.0	0.9**
		5	129	3.8	145	4.5	0.8**
		6	142	4.8	165	5.7	0.9
	49th St.	4	71	2.4	102	5.0	2.6
		5	92	3.3	112	4.5	1.2
		6	79	3.8	77	4.6	0.8
	Holmes	4	59	2.9	65	4.8	2.0**
		5	63	3.5	66	6.0	2.4**
		6	63	4.5	75	6.4	1.9
	Hooper	4	105	2.9	138	4.2	1.3
		5	163	3.3	161	4.6	1.3
		6	123	4.2	139	4.9	0.7
	Lillian	4	51	2.8	59	4.4	1.6
		5	62	4.0	70	5.6	1.6
		6	53	4.9	58	6.6	1.7
	Main	4	123	2.9	143	4.0	1.1
		5	120	3.4	132	4.3	0.9
		6	136	4.6	140	5.2	0.6

*Grade equivalent (G.E.) is based on mean raw score.

**See explanatory note at end of table.

TABLE B (Cont.)

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.*	POST N_2	POST G.E.*	GAIN
NORTH	Miramonte	4	170	3.0	161	3.9	0.9
		5	155	3.3	167	4.1	0.8
		6	119	4.1	140	4.7	0.6
	Nevin	4	63	2.7	61	3.9	1.2
		5	56	3.5	52	5.1	1.6
		6	57	4.1	56	5.1	1.0
	68th St.	4	150	2.8	130	3.5	0.7
		5	146	3.5	145	4.3	0.8
		6	110	4.3	119	4.9	0.6
	61st St.	4	109	2.8	118	3.7	0.8**
		5	115	3.4	127	4.4	1.0
		6	101	4.3	111	4.9	0.6
	66th St.	4	130	2.9	140	4.3	1.3**
		5	156	3.9	149	4.8	0.9
		6	123	4.5	126	5.5	1.0
	Trinity	4	81	2.3	88	3.7	1.4
		5	97	3.2	104	4.1	0.9
		6	85	4.6	90	4.8	0.2
	20th St.	4	41	2.9	43	3.6	0.7
		5	48	3.4	42	4.5	1.1
		6	47	3.9	48	4.6	0.7
	28th St.	4	101	3.1	91	4.6	1.5
		5	85	3.7	89	5.0	1.3
		6	67	4.4	86	4.9	0.5
	Wadsworth	4	128	2.7	110	3.9	1.2
		5	118	3.6	123	4.4	0.8
		6	89	4.4	99	5.0	0.6
SOUTH	Compton	4	48	2.8	65	3.4	0.6
		5	67	3.5	67	4.4	1.0**
		6	58	4.1	65	5.0	0.9
	Graham	4	135	3.0	138	4.1	1.1
		5	119	3.6	83	4.6	1.0
		6	109	4.5	116	4.8	0.3
	Grape	4	75	2.2	109	3.4	1.2
		5	89	3.0	92	4.1	1.1
		6	56	3.8	49	4.7	0.9
	95th St.	4	169	2.7	175	3.8	1.1
		5	115	3.3	131	4.3	1.0
		6	126	4.3	152	5.2	0.9

*Grade equivalent (G.E.) is based on mean raw score.
**See explanatory note at end of table.

TABLE B (Cont.)

AREA	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.*	POST N_2	POST G.E.*	GAIN
	99th St.	4	89	2.7	94	3.4	0.7
		5	102	3.7	109	4.6	0.9
		6	71	4.6	77	5.0	0.4
	97th St.	4	173	2.7	137	3.8	1.2**
		5	132	3.4	128	4.5	1.1
		6	158	4.4	142	5.2	0.8
	96th St.	4	95	2.6	101	3.3	0.7
		5	92	3.2	103	4.2	0.9**
		6	85	3.9	93	4.8	0.9
	111th St.	4	132	2.6	132	3.5	0.9
		5	110	3.5	105	4.6	1.2**
		6	106	4.2	106	5.0	0.8
	109th St.	4	58	2.7	68	3.9	1.2
		5	43	3.2	54	4.4	1.1**
		6	71	4.2	66	5.2	1.0
	102nd St.	4	106	2.6	114	3.4	0.8
		5	131	3.3	132	4.2	0.9
		6	111	4.1	112	4.5	0.4
	107th St.	4	144	2.7	143	3.9	1.2
		5	118	3.6	131	4.3	0.7
		6	102	4.1	118	4.7	0.6
	Parmelee	4	155	3.0	140	4.2	1.2
		5	150	3.8	134	4.6	0.8
		6	136	4.3	133	5.0	0.7
	Ritter	4	32	2.9	23	3.2	0.3
		5	48	3.3	49	4.1	0.9**
		6	35	3.9	45	4.4	0.4**
	Russell	4	144	2.7	151	3.7	1.0
		5	121	3.3	128	4.1	0.8
		6	134	4.1	141	4.7	0.6
	75th St.	4	182	2.5	189	3.5	1.0
		5	195	3.6	173	4.2	0.6
		6	107	4.2	181	4.8	0.6
	South Park	4	136	2.9	146	3.9	1.0
		5	107	3.5	130	4.1	0.6
		6	135	4.4	130	5.0	0.6

*Grade equivalent (G.E.) is based on mean raw score.

**Note: Apparent discrepancies in gain scores (e.g., 4.0 to 4.7 shows a gain of 0.8) are not in error but the result of their computation prior to rounding off the G.E. scores for reporting.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Abstract

Pupils	1039
Schools	20
Teachers (Title I)	13
Teachers (AB938)	19
Consultants	2
Specialist	1
Approximate Cost	$160,500

Description: The English as a Second Language (ESL) component served pupils who were unable to speak English or were having difficulty in speaking English because of primary use of a foreign language at home.

The pupils, predominantly from Spanish-speaking environments, were served from kindergarten through sixth grade in classes ranging from nine to eighteen. They initially were identified and recommended for this component by their classroom teachers. Most referrals were screened by teachers and principals. English as a Second Language teachers screened pupils by means of oral interviews and diagnostic tests to determine their English comprehension, pronunciation, and fluency in speech patterns.

Time Intervals: The component was in operation from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Class periods ranged from 30 minutes to one hour in length.

Activities: The audio-lingual approach was emphasized in the initial stages of the program. Vocabulary development utilized selected language patterns, ideas, concepts, interests, and experiences which were familiar to the pupils in their native language.

Teachers provided opportunities for reading as soon as pupils gained some background in listening and speaking. Pupils next learned to write, using materials from the regular reading program and examples from their own conversation.

Before classes began the specialist and consultants planned and conducted 10 days of preservice for new ESL teachers. Subject matter included the problems and the needs of non-English-speaking children.

During the year the specialist and consultants planned and conducted monthly two-and-one-half hour inservice meetings. There the subject areas introduced during the preservice meetings were expanded and discussed in greater depth, drawing increased relevance from the participants' actual ESL teaching experiences.

Objective:

- To improve the verbal functioning level (English) of the children

Evaluation Strategy: ESL pupils in each of the 20 ESEA schools and pupils in each of the seven comparison schools were given, pre and post, the ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test. The comparison group was composed of pupils who spoke little or no English but did not participate in the ESL classes.

Results: The adjusted mean score attained by the ESEA group on the ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test was significantly higher than the adjusted mean score of the comparison group.

Ratings by parents, classroom teachers, ESL teachers, and administrators indicated that the program was effective in improving the verbal functional level, the attitudes, and the academic skills of pupils.

An inservice education program was conducted to provide training and development of skills that would aid in attainment of the objective. Teacher participants indicated that the program was successful.

Conclusions: The objective of improving the verbal functioning level (English) of children was attained. Parent and staff ratings and testing confirmed the effectiveness of the component.

Recommendations: The component should be continued and expanded.

Existing facilities should be improved and new facilities added, as needed; the number of ESL teachers should be increased; self-contained classrooms should be used; periods of instruction should be lengthened; and coordination of activities between ESL and regular classroom teachers should be improved.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Detailed Report

Attainment of component objectives was evaluated by pupil scores on the ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test, analysis of staff comments and recommendations, and analysis of parent responses to a questionnaire.

The ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test, developed by the ESL/Bilingual Center at San Diego, California, was administered to ESL pupils and to a comparison group in October 1969 (pre) and in May 1970 (post). The comparison group was composed of pupils who would have qualified for English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction if funding had made it possible to include their schools in the program.

The second level of the ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test had not been completed at the time of posttesting. Use of this portion of the test would have enabled many pupils who scored at the ceiling of the first level to have shown their total growth. Also, a teacher strike, during which there was little or no ESL instruction, affected the gains of these pupils.

Parent responses to a questionnaire and ratings and comments by regular classroom teachers, ESL teachers, and administrators were obtained at midyear.

Objective: To improve the verbal functioning level (English) of the children.

The ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test consisted of Level 1, Parts I and II, with a maximum raw score of 77. The test measured the students' ability to produce basic linguistic structures in sentence patterns.

Means obtained on the test by ESEA Title I and comparison groups are shown in Table A. The ESEA group had a lower pre mean but a higher post mean score than the comparison group. The F ratio on the adjusted means of the test was significant at the .01 level in favor of the ESEA group.

TABLE A

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE BETWEEN ESL AND COMPARISON GROUPS

GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
ESEA Title I	795	3.83	46.62	46.89
Comparison	117	4.85	19.55	17.68
				F(1,909) = 172.27**

Table A is based on ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test.

**Significant at the .01 level.

Only 25% of the parents reported that they spoke English at home with their children. Nearly all of the parents thought their children's English had improved. Seventy-five percent of the parents had received information about the program (Table B).

TABLE B

PARENT RESPONSES

ITEM	PERCENTAGE YES	NO	N
Do you speak in English at home with your child?	24.9	75.1	577
Do you feel your child improved in speaking English?	95.9	4.1	564
Did you receive information about the program?	74.7	25.3	570
Would you like to have this program continued?	98.2	1.8	547
Did you visit the program?	31.2	68.8	554
Are you taking adult school courses in English?	15.2	84.8	567

Table B is based on Form 003P. Maximum N = 580

Virtually all parents wished to have their children enrolled in the class next year. However, approximately 70% of the parents responding said they had not visited an English as a Second Language class.

Table C shows that the regular classroom teachers reported improvement in pupils' pronunciation skills, speech patterns, vocabulary, learning skills, and attitude toward speaking English. These teachers felt that pupil selection was appropriate and that pupils increased their use of English in informal situations. Most teachers had sent two to four of their pupils to the ESL class.

TABLE C

CLASSROOM TEACHER RATINGS

ITEM	FREQUENCY 0 Doesn't Apply	1 Ineffective	2 Somewhat Effective	3 Effective	4 Very Effective	MEDIAN
Improvement of pupil pronunciation skills	3	8	67	130	54	2.9
Improvement of pupil speech patterns	3	8	71	134	47	2.9
Improvement of pupil vocabulary	2	5	62	122	74	3.0
Improvement of pupil learning skills	6	9	79	108	57	2.9
Improvement of pupil attitude toward speaking English	3	9	38	119	95	3.2
Appropriate pupil selection	4	7	32	117	99	3.3
Pupils' increased use of English in informal situations	3	18	59	108	75	3.0

Table C is based on Form 003T (1-4 scale). N = 268

Most of the 21 ESL teachers and 20 administrators who responded to an open-end questionnaire felt that English as a Second Language was a strong program.

An inservice program was conducted to assist participating teachers in fulfillment of the objective.

Teachers rated the inservice education by filling out an inservice questionnaire which asked them to rate their "Expectations" before the beginning of each meeting and their "Fulfillment" as of the close of each meeting. Generally, both expectations and fulfillment ranged from 3.2 to 3.8 medians on a 5-point scale.

Two meetings, "Teaching Strategies and Multi-Media," and "Linguistics - Dr. Ricardo Cornejo," received higher ratings on both "Expectations" (3.8 and 4.3 medians) and "Fulfillment" (4.4 and 4.6 medians), respectively. The meeting on "Making Instructional Tapes" received a higher (4.1 median) "Expectations" rating but a lower (2.7 median) "Fulfillment" rating.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The component attained its objective of improving the verbal functioning level (English) of the children.

Parents enthusiastically endorsed the program. It was noted that only 15% were taking adult school courses in English, though more than 75% were not speaking English at home with the child.

Regular classroom teachers stressed the need for more ESL teachers. They felt that ESL children would benefit more in a self-contained classroom, that periods of instruction should be longer than 30 minutes, that materials should be provided for regular classroom use in follow-up work done in the ESL class, and that there should be more communication between themselves and the ESL teacher.

Of the 21 ESL teachers responding, seven mentioned in open-end comments that the materials and supplies available were one of the strengths of the program. Need for specific materials; development of teaching methods and techniques; additional classroom space; and inclusion of such facilities as bulletin boards, teaching charts, and large tables, were mentioned by 10 of the teachers.

Most of the 20 administrators responding felt that English as a Second Language was a strong program and that teachers were doing an outstanding job. Again, administrators agreed with teachers in the recommendation that additional ESL positions should be budgeted.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: TEACHER-LIBRARIAN

Abstract

Pupils	40,600
Schools	40
Teachers	40
Approximate Cost	Included in Reading

Description: Teacher-librarians at 40 of the 55 ESEA Title I schools supplemented classroom instruction by providing lessons in literature appreciation, reading and research skills, as well as library usage, to more than 40,000 pupils from kindergarten through sixth grade.

Time Intervals: The component encompassed the period from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Only rarely, however, was it possible to schedule pupils into the library prior to mid-October; and, in a number of cases, no teacher-librarian was available until December or even later.

Classes typically were scheduled to visit the library once a week for periods of 30 to 60 minutes. In larger schools and in schools where the teacher-librarian served other functions classes met less frequently, usually once every two weeks. In a few cases, because departmentalized programs complicated scheduling, some pupils did not receive instruction from the teacher-librarian.

Activities: Teacher-librarians taught lessons in literature appreciation, reading and research skills, as well as library usage, in addition to assisting with the selection and checking in and out of books. They served as resource persons to classroom teachers in the selection of literature, materials, and aids for classroom instruction. Pupils participated in library clubs, choral reading, storytelling, and dramatizations; constructed dioramas and puppets; and conducted research on assigned topics.

Flexible schedules developed by some librarians provided time for them to guide pupils in individual or small-group research projects. Provision for individuals and small groups also allowed the librarian to assist with selection of books to be read for pleasure.

An inservice education program was conducted to assist participants in fulfillment of the objective.

Preservice instruction was provided for new teacher-librarians who were assigned to positions by September 1969. Instruction included presentation of library books relating to all curriculum areas, library skills lessons, and organizational patterns to increase competence in the mechanics of library management. Those who were assigned later received special assistance from the library coordinator.

The Library Section conducted monthly inservice for teacher-librarians, alternating between group meetings at the Library Section and demonstration-visits to school libraries. The group meetings, intended for all the teacher-librarians, included presentations of materials, lesson plans, book reviews, organizational plans, and a review of literature on ethnic minorities, as well as displays of new materials, books, and pictures available from the Library Section. The demonstration-visits were split geographically so that two were held at nearly the same time, each for about half the teacher-librarians. As the name implies, there was a dual purpose for these sessions: to observe exemplar demonstration lessons taught by experienced teacher-librarians; and to observe various techniques of library management and organization, including some stimulating and artistic arrangements of library interiors.

Objective:

- To improve classroom performance in other skill areas (library skills) beyond usual expectations

Evaluation Strategy: A revised version of the Library Skills Test (LST), a locally developed instrument designed to assess pupil knowledge of some basic facts about the library and ability to apply these facts to research problems, was given to a random sample of classes at the beginning of the school year and to another random sample at the end. Since different random selection procedures were used, the classes which received both pre- and posttests were randomly chosen - though there was a greater probability of a class in a small school, with few classes at each grade level, receiving both pre- and posttests.

Schools with no teacher-librarians assigned for 1969-70 served as a comparison for schools which had teacher-librarians, with the revised LST focusing on skills not normally taught by the classroom teacher.

It is important to note that the test necessarily focused on skills which made up an important subset of objectives of the program. Equaly important objectives of improving interests and skill in reading, aiding selection of literature, and building experiential background were not readily accessible to evaluation.

The evaluation was designed to explore the relationship of a number of variables to scores attained on the posttest. Variables examined included presence or lack of a teacher-librarian, time in the library, schools 90% or more Mexican American or Negro, and whether or not the class had received the pretest.

Results: Schools with teacher-librarians significantly outperformed those without the services of teacher-librarian. No differences were found between schools which were predominantly Mexican American and predominantly Negro. However, Negro pupils with no teacher-librarian were significantly poorer than Negro pupils who had a teacher-librarian, while this effect appeared only at the sixth grade in Mexican American Schools.

Evidence that the pretest influenced achievement on the posttest was apparent: pupils having a teacher-librarian did significantly better on the LST than pupils without this assistance when neither group had had the pretest.

Analysis of scores by treatment and amount of time in the library showed that the teacher-librarian group spent more time in the library, and was significantly superior on the LST at the fourth and sixth grades (but not at the fifth) than the group with no teacher-librarian. The amount of time in the library, however, did not seem to be related significantly to scores on the LST.

Approximately half the schools reported provisions for use of the library by individuals or small groups, and indicated that the library was open before or after school. Of the 55 ESEA schools, 21 allowed pupils to check out books for home use. Teachers rated the quality of library instruction received by their classes, half of them saying "excellent", and another 23% indicating "good". Nearly 15% rated their library instruction as "poor", and most were at schools not served by a teacher-librarian.

Conclusions: Teacher-librarians contributed significantly to better performance in research and library skills, as measured by a test of library skills. Findings in previous years of no differences between pupils served by a teacher-librarian and those without such services may be explained: (a) in terms of test-retest interaction (matched samples were used), (b) the fact that classes knew in advance they would again receive the test, and (c) the possibility that the previous test did not adequately discriminate between skills normally taught in the classroom and those which tended to be uniquely in the domain of the librarian. Having a teacher-librarian appeared to benefit Negro pupils more than Mexican American pupils, but did not seem to make much difference when pupils had been exposed to the test previously.

In terms of the limited set of skills measured by the LST, evidence indicates that the teacher-librarians achieved their objective. Comments by teachers and administrators suggest strongly that they have achieved much more.

Recommendations: Provide a teacher-librarian for every school.

Wherever possible, libraries should be open before and after school to consider using part-time aides to assist with time-consuming clerical duties (cataloguing, shelving, checking books in and out, and so on) which would free the librarian to work with individuals and small groups doing library research.

TEACHER-LIBRARIAN

Detailed Report

Evaluation of the Teacher-Librarian program sought to explain findings of no difference for the past few years. Two explanations seemed most plausible, assuming that differences between pupils taught by a teacher-librarian (TL) and those not receiving such instruction (NOTL) really did exist. One was that the test did not differentiate between skills taught uniquely by the librarian and those taught commonly by the classroom teacher. The other was that test-retest interaction explained the findings. Support was found for both contentions.

Objective: To improve classroom performance in other skill areas (library skills) beyond usual expectations

Analysis of results of the evaluation revealed significant differences between TL and NOTL classes at each grade. No differences were found between ethnic groups when treatment was controlled, and time in the library seemed not to affect test results. The comparisons and findings at each grade are summarized below:

Comparisons	Grades	Sign.
(1) TL vs. NOTL	4	.01
	5	.05
	6	.01
(2) TL vs. NOTL within Mexican American Schools	4	NS
	5	NS
	6	.05
(3) TL vs. NOTL within Negro Schools	4	.01
	5	.05
	6	.01
(4) Mexican American vs. Negro with TL	all	NS
(5) Differences in Library Time with TL	all	NS
(6) Differences in Library Time without TL	all	.05
(7,8) Retest vs Posttest Only Within Ethnic Groups	all	NS
(9) TL vs. NOTL (Posttest Only)	4	.01
	5	.05
	6	.01
(10) TL vs. NOTL Time covaried	4	.01
	5	NS
	6	.01
(11) TL vs. NOTL (Retest)	all	NS

TL = Schools with teacher-librarian
NOTL = Schools without teacher-librarian
NS = Not significant

Approximately half the schools reported that their libraries were available for use by individuals or small groups during the day, and that they were open before and/or after school. Some libraries were available at noon. Pupils at 21 of the 55 ESEA schools were allowed to check books out for home use.

Teacher ratings of the quality of instruction in library skills were very positive: half rated the program as "excellent"; 23% rated it "good"; while 15% rated it as "poor," and most were at schools not served by a teacher-librarian.

Preservice sessions included presentation of library books relating to curriculum areas, library skills lesson plans, and techniques of library management. Monthly inservice programs also were conducted to aid teacher-librarians in achieving their objectives. On alternate months demonstrations were held to provide them with opportunities to observe exemplar lessons and management techniques. On other months meetings included presentation of materials, lesson and organizational plans and book reviews, as well as reviews of literature on ethnic minorities, displays of books and materials available from the library section, panel discussions and lecture-presentations on various library-related topics. Ratings of inservice were elicited from teacher-librarians on the following areas: usefulness in conducting library program and in professional growth; contribution of group meetings to on-the-job effectiveness; contribution of demonstration lessons to on-the-job effectiveness; etc. The modal response in each area (on a scale of 1 = not at all, 4 = very much) was a very positive "4".

Strengths and Weaknesses

Evidence was strong that the teacher-librarians achieved their stated objective. Teachers and administrators indicated that the program was of service to schools.

The library coordinator and committees of teacher-librarians are defining more clearly the objectives of the teacher-librarian in terms of observable pupil behaviors. A flexible scheduling plan was developed which - with the addition of an aide - allows the teacher-librarian time to assist small groups and individuals working on research projects.

So long as the teacher-librarian plays a supportive and complementary role to the classroom teacher, and so long as teachers expand on the instruction given by teacher-librarians, normative testing does not seem likely to be a very effective or meaningful tool. Identification of sets of facts and skills requisite to efficient use of the library, and administration of criterion-referenced tests to judge attainment or nonattainment of the requisite facts or skills, would be more useful. Pupils possessing these skills should be able to function effectively in the library; pupils lacking them would receive specific instruction.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: PRE-KINDERGARTEN

Abstract

Pupils	983
Schools	37
Staff	
Teachers	64
Education Aides	64
Other full-time personnel	3
Approximate Cost	$987,165

Description: The Pre-Kindergarten program was designed to help meet the children's individual needs and to assist them in achieving greater success in school.

Classes consisted of a maximum of 15 children who would be of Kindergarten age in the following year. Criteria used for selection included such factors as family circumstances, housing, economic status, and cultural background.

A diagnostic-prescriptive approach was utilized in the 64 classes involved. In each class of 15 children a teacher and an education aide planned indoor and outdoor activities to aid the individual child in developing perceptual and motor skills, appropriate social-emotional behavior, and readiness for successful academic performance.

In addition to full-time teachers, consultants, and the coordinator-specialist, part-time counselors and health services personnel also assisted in the component.

Time Intervals: The component operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Daily classes were held for three hours either in the morning or afternoon. Teachers made home visits four days a week.

Activities: Children's experiences included observing plants and animals and caring for them; participating in dramatic representations, particularly in the playhouse center; manipulating puzzles, blocks, and puppets; using toy telephones, wheel toys, and playground equipment; singing and listening to music; exploring art media; viewing films; and engaging in walking trips into the community. The children were able to explore and enjoy such activities individually, in small groups, and as members of an entire class. Instructional media included visual aids to help in learning to distinguish shapes; record players for use by children with listening difficulties; tape recorders to remediate speech difficulties; matching pictures for language development; and games designed to teach number concepts.

In morning or afternoon, when they were not involved in class work, teachers made home visits, engaged in individual pupil and parent conferences, maintained records, acquired supplies and materials, and attended inservice meetings.

Parents and community volunteers participated in this program on a rotating basis, with parent meetings held monthly in the several schools. Frequent staff conferences were held with teachers and supportive staff members.

Objectives:

- To improve the verbal functioning level of the children
- To improve the nonverbal functioning level of the children
- To improve the children's self-image
- To increase the children's expectations of success in school

Evaluation Strategy: The Caldwell Preschool Inventory was administered to each child in October 1969 (pretest) and in May 1970 (posttest).

Parents, teachers, and administrators rated various aspects of the program, and teachers evaluated their education aides.

Results: Each subtest of the Caldwell Preschool Inventory and the total test were analyzed by means of t tests, comparing pre- and posttest results. Posttest scores were significantly higher than pretest scores (at .001 level).

Parents responded very favorably to questionnaires sent to them, indicating that children progressed especially in ability to get along with other children and in doing things for themselves. Over 99% of parents wanted the program continued.

Questionnaires completed by teachers and administrators reflected the belief that children benefited greatly from component activities. Teacher ratings of education aides indicated that aides were highly effective.

Conclusions: The objectives of the component were met, as measured by the Caldwell Preschool Inventory. The program was well received by parents. Teachers and administrators attributed the success of the program to parental participation, effectiveness of teachers and aides, and small class size.

Recommendation: Continue the component.

PRE-KINDERGARTEN

Detailed Report

Attainment of component objectives was evaluated according to pupil scores on The Bettye Caldwell Preschool Inventory; open-end comments by administrators, teachers, and consultants, and questionnaire response by parents. The Preschool Inventory was completed by pupils at the beginning and again at the end of the school year; and parents and school employees evaluated the program at midyear.

Objectives: To improve the verbal functioning level of the children.
To improve the nonverbal functioning level of the children.
To improve the children's self-image.
To increase the children's expectation of success in school

Results of the Preschool Inventory, administered pre and post to 729 of the 960 children in the program, are summarized in Table A.

Signiiicant differences were found between pre and post means from t tests. Differences were highly significant (at .001 level) for all subtests and for the total test, in favor of the posttest.

TABLE A

CALDWELL PRESCHOOL INVENTORY RESULTS (FOR ALL SCHOOLS)

	MEAN RAW SCORES		
	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Subtest A, Personal-social Responsiveness	13.6	20.8	7.2***
Subtest B, Associative Vocabulary	6.4	15.3	8.9***
Subtest C_1, Concept Activation, Numerical	6.4	12.3	5.9***
Subtest C_2, Concept Activation, Sensory	9.9	15.1	5.2***
Total Test	36.3	63.5	27.2***

N = 729 ***significant at .001 level

A school-by-school listing of test results may be found in Table D. Mean raw scores for the pretest, posttest, and differences are shown for each of the four subtests and total scores as recorded in each class.

Table B shows that, in most respects, the majority of parents felt that their children improved "Much" on a scale of 1 (Little) to 3 (Much) as a result of

participation in the program. Parents more frequently placed a "Much" rating on improvement in ability to get along with other children than on any other category (74%). A large number of parent-respondents (183 of 252) expressed a desire for additional field trips for children as a means of improving the program. Relatively few, however, thought that the number of home visits by teachers should be increased. Almost all parents who responded said that their children benefited from the program; that they were kept informed about the program; and that the program should be continued.

The composite teacher ratings of aides is shown in Table C.

On a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale, individual teacher ratings resulted in medians ranging from 4.6 (helpfulness of aides in working with parents and other adults), and in assisting teachers with other duties (willingness to carry out instructions, and having rapport with children, parents, and teachers) to 4.9. Ratings, in general, were very high.

Strengths and Weaknesses:

Strengths of the program are evident in all evaluation results. While no comparison group was utilized for the purpose of determining whether the progress made was due to component activities, the growth in achievement, as measured by the Caldwell Preschool Inventory, was impressive.

Responses to questionnaires were received from 88% of administrators and 46% of teachers to whom they were sent. Of 28 completed forms returned by administrators, 17 indicated generally positive comments, 17 noted that parent participation and enthusiasm was good, and five categorized this component as the best or one of the best of the Title I programs. Three recommended that the program be expanded.

Twelve of 25 responding teachers commented in general on the effectiveness of the program. Ten mentioned especially the enthusiasm of and participation by parents, seven noted the helpfulness of their education aides, five attributed success of the program at least partially to small class size, and four wrote of the effectiveness of teachers' home visits and/or inservice education.

As to weaknesses, eight teachers agreed with five administrators that supplies and equipment were inadequate, and six thought that parent involvement was insufficient (at midyear more than 20% of the parents had been unable to visit the program).

Seven teachers recommended field trips for the children, six felt the program should be expanded, and five wanted the number of resource personnel increased.

TABLE B
PARENT EVALUATION

Predominant ethnicity of school	Mexican American			Negro		
Number of questionnaires sent to parents	195			285		
Number of completed questionnaires returned in time for analysis	79			173		
Percent of response	41%			61%		
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS						
Section A	None*	1-6	7+	None*	1-6	7+
About how many times did you visit the program?	22%	34%	44%	20%	54%	26%
If you did not visit, or seldom visited, please indicate reason:						
a. Working away from home	40%			31%		
b. Taking care of younger children	50			46		
c. Lack of transportation	03			0		
d. Some other reason	07			23		
Section B						
Did your child improve in:	Little	Some-what	Much	Little	Some-what	Much
1. Playing and getting along with other children?	05%	21%	74%	04%	22%	74%
2. Speaking better English?	18	21	61	11	26	63
3. Showing awareness of numbers?	11	33	56	17	19	64
4. Doing things for himself?	07	26	67	05	21	74
5. Being responsible for his actions?	12	36	52	14	41	45
6. Showing respect for property of others?	04	28	68	11	35	54
7. Expressing himself orally?	15	37	48	12	23	65
Section C						
Should the program include:	More	About the Same	Less	More	About the Same	Less
1. Educational field trips?	66%	31%	03%	76%	21%	03%
2. Participation of mothers?	40	56	04	58	36	06
3. Home visits by teacher?	36	61	03	30	67	03
4. Teaching of English?	55	45	00	60	39	01
5. Educational aides for the teacher?	57	43	00	65	33	02
Section D						
		Yes	No	Yes	No	
1. Do you feel your child benefited from the program?		100%	00%	98%	02%	
2. Were you kept informed about the program?		100	00	96	04	
3. Should the program be continued?		100	00	99	01	
4. Should the daily program be longer?		33	67	43	57	

Table B is based on Form 005P.

*or not indicated

TABLE C

TEACHER RATINGS OF EDUCATION AIDES

ITEM	MEDIAN RATINGS* PRE-KINDERGARTEN N = 40	KINDERGARTEN N = 18	FOLLOW THROUGH N = 15
Rating of aides in terms of:			
- Ability to carry out instruction	4.8	4.8	4.2
- Willingness to carry out instructions	4.9	4.9	4.8
- Conscientiousness (e.g., working six full hours each day)	4.8	4.6	4.8
- Rapport with children	4.9	4.9	4.6
- Rapport with parents	4.9	4.9	4.6
- Rapport with teachers	4.9	4.8	4.8
Extent to which the presence of aides gave teachers more time for professional duties	4.7	4.5	4.0
Helpfulness of aides in working with pupils	4.8	4.8	4.4
Helpfulness of aides in working with parents and other adults	4.6	4.7	4.1
Helpfulness of aides in assisting teachers with other duties	4.6	4.5	4.5

Table C is based on Form 000S-A.
*Based on a 1-5 scale.

TABLE D

CALDWELL PRESCHOOL INVENTORY RESULTS, 1969-70 (BY SCHOOLS)

SCHOOL	N	MEANS OF SUBTESTS* A Pre	A Post	A Diff	B Pre	B Post	B Diff	C_1 Pre	C_1 Post	C_1 Diff	C_2 Pre	C_2 Post	C_2 Diff	MEANS OF TOTAL TEST Pre	Post	Diff
Ascot	12	17.3	21.8	4.5	9.2	17.9	8.7	6.9	13.9	7.0	10.8	16.8	6.0	44.3	70.3	26.0
	9	14.4	24.8	10.4	9.3	19.3	10.0	7.4	16.1	8.7	10.7	18.2	7.5	41.9	78.4	36.5
Belvedere	15	7.3	19.9	12.6	3.0	15.2	12.2	4.7	12.6	7.9	7.6	15.3	7.7	22.5	63.1	40.6
	14	7.4	18.2	10.8	2.4	11.1	8.7	4.3	10.0	5.7	8.5	13.6	5.1	22.6	53.0	30.4
Breed	10	5.0	15.7	10.7	4.1	10.7	6.6	3.0	9.8	6.8	6.4	14.3	7.9	18.5	50.5	32.0
Brooklyn	12	17.0	22.4	5.4	6.3	19.0	12.7	7.3	13.3	6.0	11.9	16.5	4.6	42.6	71.2	28.6
	12	14.8	21.5	6.7	6.8	15.7	8.9	9.0	12.5	3.5	10.3	15.2	4.9	40.8	64.8	24.0
Compton	13	13.6	20.6	7.0	4.4	12.9	8.5	6.6	9.9	3.3	9.5	14.4	4.9	34.2	57.7	23.5
Cortez	13	8.5	17.2	8.7	2.5	6.4	3.9	4.1	9.4	5.3	9.9	13.9	4.0	24.9	46.9	22.0
Eastman	11	11.2	20.8	9.6	6.6	15.3	8.7	6.6	13.6	7.0	9.6	15.0	5.4	33.9	64.6	30.7
	9	10.1	22.9	12.8	4.7	20.1	15.4	5.6	15.1	9.5	9.0	17.9	8.9	29.3	76.0	46.7
Evergreen	11	11.6	19.6	8.0	5.9	14.2	8.3	6.6	12.8	6.2	10.0	15.3	5.3	34.0	61.8	27.8
	13	11.6	19.5	7.9	5.5	13.8	8.3	7.2	13.9	6.7	10.3	15.8	5.5	34.5	63.0	28.5
Ford	11	13.3	22.8	9.5	5.3	18.7	13.4	7.0	15.6	8.6	11.2	17.6	6.4	36.7	74.8	38.1
	12	12.8	20.2	7.4	6.4	16.6	10.2	5.4	14.1	8.7	9.1	16.7	7.6	33.7	67.5	33.8
49th St.	14	17.6	22.5	4.9	7.5	14.3	6.8	8.3	13.0	4.7	10.8	14.3	3.5	44.1	64.1	20.0
Graham	9	10.2	21.3	11.1	5.6	16.1	10.5	4.4	15.2	10.8	10.1	17.3	7.2	30.3	70.0	39.7
Grape	14	17.9	22.3	4.4	8.0	14.3	6.3	6.1	11.0	4.9	10.6	15.9	5.3	42.5	63.1	20.6
Hammel	13	13.9	20.5	6.6	8.3	13.5	5.2	7.6	12.5	4.9	9.6	14.9	5.3	39.5	61.3	21.8
	13	13.6	21.5	7.9	6.7	14.5	7.8	7.2	13.4	6.2	8.6	14.8	6.2	36.2	64.1	27.9

TABLE D (Continued)

SCHOOL	N	MEANS OF SUBTESTS* A Pre	A Post	A Diff	B Pre	B Post	B Diff	C_1 Pre	C_1 Post	C_1 Diff	C_2 Pre	C_2 Post	C_2 Diff	MEANS OF TOTAL TEST Pre	Post	Diff
Harrison	7	12.6	20.4	7.8	6.7	18.4	11.7	6.0	14.1	8.1	9.7	16.9	7.2	35.0	69.9	34.9
	10	11.6	22.3	10.7	8.0	17.3	9.3	6.5	13.3	6.8	9.9	16.0	6.1	36.0	68.8	32.8
Hooper	10	19.0	22.9	3.9	8.6	15.2	6.6	9.3	10.2	0.9	12.9	16.2	3.3	49.8	64.5	14.7
Main	11	18.7	25.3	6.6	8.1	18.0	9.9	7.7	16.2	8.5	9.5	17.3	7.8	44.9	76.7	31.8
	12	18.8	22.5	3.7	8.8	19.6	10.8	9.0	15.3	6.3	12.3	16.0	3.7	48.8	73.3	24.5
	12	16.4	24.8	8.4	8.0	22.4	14.4	7.5	17.9	10.4	10.5	17.8	7.3	42.4	82.9	40.5
	15	15.9	22.5	6.6	8.7	17.0	8.3	6.5	12.1	5.6	10.5	15.7	5.2	41.7	67.3	25.6
Malabar	7	13.7	17.7	4.0	5.9	14.7	8.8	5.0	10.7	5.7	8.9	13.7	4.8	33.4	56.9	23.5
	6	17.7	19.0	1.3	11.7	12.5	0.8	9.3	13.3	4.0	14.0	16.3	2.3	52.7	61.2	8.5
Miramonte	12	10.3	21.3	11.0	3.3	15.6	12.3	4.5	12.3	7.8	6.9	14.3	7.4	25.1	63.5	38.4
	14	14.2	23.4	8.2	6.5	19.0	12.5	7.2	14.2	7.0	9.1	16.6	7.5	37.1	73.1	36.0
Murchison	12	7.7	13.8	6.1	3.1	9.9	6.8	4.0	8.0	4.0	5.9	12.3	6.4	00.0	44.0	44.0
	12	8.6	14.5	5.9	2.7	9.4	6.7	4.3	8.8	4.5	8.3	14.0	5.7	23.8	46.8	23.0
99th St.	14	16.4	23.6	7.2	12.0	21.6	9.6	8.3	15.1	6.8	11.4	17.2	5.8	48.1	77.5	29.4
96th St.	13	21.3	25.1	3.8	13.5	20.4	6.9	9.9	14.9	5.0	11.6	17.5	5.9	56.2	77.8	21.6
	10	19.4	24.0	4.6	11.9	15.5	3.6	9.6	14.1	4.5	11.7	17.9	6.2	52.6	71.5	18.9
111th St.	10	15.5	21.1	5.6	6.5	15.6	9.1	7.1	11.9	4.8	10.5	15.2	4.7	39.6	63.8	24.2
	14	16.0	21.6	5.6	6.2	15.5	9.3	7.1	11.5	4.4	8.9	14.4	5.5	38.1	63.0	24.9
109th St.	12	16.1	20.5	4.4	6.1	14.0	7.9	6.6	10.3	3.7	8.7	14.3	5.6	37.4	59.0	21.6
	10	14.4	21.4	7.0	6.8	14.2	7.4	7.2	11.0	3.8	8.4	11.5	3.1	36.8	58.1	21.3
102nd St.	11	17.9	22.4	4.5	7.6	17.4	9.8	7.9	12.2	4.3	9.4	14.8	5.4	42.7	66.7	24.0
112th St.	12	14.2	22.6	8.4	9.5	20.0	11.5	5.5	14.6	9.1	11.3	16.3	5.0	40.7	73.5	32.8
	13	15.5	24.5	9.0	7.8	21.5	13.7	3.9	15.9	12.0	9.5	16.0	6.5	36.7	77.9	41.2

TABLE D (Continued)

SCHOOL	N	MEANS OF SUBTESTS* A Pre	A Post	A Diff	B Pre	B Post	B Diff	C_1 Pre	C_1 Post	C_1 Diff	C_2 Pre	C_2 Post	C_2 Diff	MEANS OF TOTAL TEST Pre	Post	Diff
Rowan	9	10.6	22.9	12.3	5.2	16.0	10.8	5.4	14.0	8.6	8.9	16.2	7.3	30.1	69.1	39.0
	13	11.0	22.9	11.9	5.7	17.1	11.4	5.2	13.8	8.6	8.7	15.5	6.8	30.6	69.3	38.7
Russell	13	19.2	22.8	3.6	9.5	19.4	9.9	10.1	12.3	2.2	11.6	16.5	4.9	50.4	71.0	20.6
	12	15.4	22.2	6.8	6.8	16.8	10.0	6.9	11.2	4.3	9.8	15.3	5.5	38.9	65.3	26.4
Second	12	7.8	15.5	7.7	2.1	10.1	8.0	3.6	9.2	5.6	7.5	11.6	4.1	20.9	46.3	25.4
75th St.	13	17.9	23.2	5.3	7.3	20.0	12.7	7.9	14.6	6.7	12.2	16.7	4.5	45.3	74.5	29.2
	11	15.6	22.4	6.8	5.4	12.8	7.4	6.8	10.6	3.8	8.8	15.2	6.4	36.6	61.0	24.4
Sheridan	11	9.8	17.1	7.3	5.4	11.9	6.5	4.6	10.8	6.2	8.9	14.6	5.7	28.7	54.5	25.8
	9	9.3	15.4	6.1	3.6	12.6	9.0	4.8	10.3	5.5	9.4	15.2	5.8	27.1	53.6	26.5
61st St.	11	13.8	18.1	4.3	5.9	8.6	2.7	6.3	8.7	2.4	8.7	12.5	3.8	34.7	47.9	13.2
South Park	11	11.8	17.4	5.6	5.2	9.1	3.9	5.7	9.1	3.4	8.3	12.7	4.4	31.0	48.3	17.3
	13	12.8	20.2	7.4	6.0	14.5	8.5	6.2	9.9	3.7	8.8	13.9	5.1	33.8	58.5	24.7
Trinity	8	15.3	23.0	7.7	8.3	17.4	7.1	6.6	11.1	4.5	10.5	14.8	4.3	40.6	66.3	25.7
28th St.	12	15.6	19.7	4.1	8.3	13.1	4.8	7.8	9.3	1.5	10.7	15.0	4.3	42.3	57.0	14.7
Utah	11	6.2	21.2	15.0	1.6	11.7	9.1	2.6	11.0	8.4	5.4	12.2	6.8	15.8	56.1	40.3
	12	13.4	20.0	6.6	6.5	15.0	8.5	8.3	12.5	4.2	9.3	13.6	4.3	37.5	61.1	23.6
	13	9.9	15.8	5.9	3.2	10.0	6.8	5.4	8.9	3.5	7.1	12.1	5.0	25.5	46.8	21.3
Wadsworth	8	14.5	20.8	6.3	7.1	16.6	9.5	6.1	10.6	4.5	8.0	13.8	5.8	35.8	61.8	26.0
	11	16.8	21.0	4.2	7.5	15.6	8.1	7.9	11.4	3.5	10.1	14.5	4.4	42.3	62.4	20.1
Weigand	11	14.7	18.9	4.2	5.2	10.8	5.6	7.5	9.1	1.6	10.6	13.5	2.9	37.9	52.3	14.4
	6	15.3	19.3	4.0	4.5	13.8	9.3	7.7	10.5	2.8	8.7	13.8	5.1	36.2	57.5	21.3

*A - Personal-Social Responsiveness
B - Associative Vocabulary
C_1 - Concept Activation-Numerical
C_2 - Concept Activation-Sensory

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: KINDERGARTEN

Abstract

Pupils	447
Schools	5
Teachers	
Title I	6
District	9
Approximate Cost	$67,200

Description: The kindergarten component provided additional services through the assignment of specially funded teachers. These teachers worked within one of, or a combination of, the following plans: teaching a class or classes of her own; working as a team teacher; working with individuals or groups on a "pullout" basis; working with individuals or groups in another teacher's classroom; serving as a relief teacher when other teachers were engaged in conference, visitation, observation, or inservice; or serving as a consultant. The program served 25 classes limited, where feasible, to 20 children.

Time Intervals: Classes met for two and one-half hours daily, either morning or afternoon, from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Regular teachers had both morning and afternoon classes.

Activities: Activities were similar to those in regular classes, but the children received increased special services according to their individual needs. Specialized teaching materials were employed, when available. Education aides assisted teachers in all classrooms, on a shared basis, however, in some schools. Teachers participated in a District inservice program designed to assist them in attainment of the objectives.

Objectives:

-To improve the verbal functioning level of the children
-To increase the children's expectations of success in school
  Raise the median gain of project participants commensurate with the time span between pre and post administration of the Metropolitan Readiness Test

Evaluation Strategy: The Metropolitan Readiness Test (Form B) was administered (pre, October 1969 and post, May 1970) to pupils in all ESEA classes and to comparison classes in both ESEA and non-ESEA schools. Teachers and administrators completed a questionnaire concerning the effectiveness of the component. Teachers rated their education aides.

Results: Post mean scores made by ESEA kindergarten children on the Metropolitan Readiness Test were above the national average for entering first graders and were numerically higher than those reported for the same component in 1969.

Adjusted mean total scores of the ESEA classes were higher than those of comparison classes in non-ESEA schools but no higher than those of comparison classes in schools with ESEA-funded classes.

Scores of children taught by specially funded kindergarten teachers augmenting the regular staff were significantly higher than scores of children taught by the regular staff with the assistance of specially funded specialists.

In contrast to preceding years, children with preschool experience made higher scores than those without experience. However, the preschool group consisted of only 17 participants. Children who had been enrolled in ESEA Pre-Kindergarten made the highest pre- and postscores, but those with Head Start experience showed greater gains. Performance of all groups on the test subscores was relatively consistent.

Staff ratings of the component were high, and written comments were favorable.

Conclusions: The objectives to improve the children's verbal functioning level and to increase their expectations of success in school were attained in schools with ESEA-funded teachers, not only by the ESEA group but by residual comparison classes in the same schools.

Use of specially funded personnel as additional kindergarten teachers produced higher gains than assignment of specialists to assist the regular kindergarten staff.

Ratings and comments by the staff affirmed the effectiveness of the component.

Recommendations: Since comparison of gains made by children in the component with those made by noncomponent groups do not show significant difference, it is questionable whether the project in its present form should be continued. If funds are allocated for its continuance, the findings indicate that specially funded personnel should be assigned as additional kindergarten teachers, supplementing the regular staff, rather than as specialists assisting the staff.

Articulation of the preschool and kindergarten programs should be studied and developed for greater effectiveness, in view of the findings that the learning achieved by children in preschool programs is repeated, rather than augmented, when they participate in the regular kindergarten program. The evidence that children without preschool experience have achieved substantially the same level of skills by the end of the kindergarten year would suggest that a better articulated program for the preschool group could be making better use of the benefits they have gained from the preschool experience.

KINDERGARTEN

Detailed Report

Attainment of the objectives was evaluated on the basis of children's scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test, teacher and administrative comments on component effectiveness, and teacher rating of aides.

The Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form B, was administered to ESEA Title I children and to a comparison group in October 1969 (pre) and in May 1970 (post). Title I youngsters were divided into two groups according to the instructional pattern which had been employed. The first group consisted of children taught by specially funded teachers supplementing the regular staff. The second group were taught by District-funded teachers who had the services of a specially funded kindergarten specialist. Comparison classes also were divided into two groups--residual kindergarten classes conducted in the same schools as the first Title I group above, and classes in non-ESEA schools.

Objectives: To improve the verbal functioning level of the children.
To increase the children's expectations of success in school.
Raise the median gain of project participants commensurate with the time span between pre and post administration of the Metropolitan Readiness Test.

Tables A and B show a comparison of test results of ESEA and comparison groups according to their preschool experience. Pupils without preschool experience made the lowest post scores on the total Metropolitan Readiness Test. Pupils with Head Start experience had the lowest prescores but showed the greatest gains, attaining post scores almost as high as pupils with ESEA preschool experience, who had achieved much higher prescores.

Table C shows the performance of the groups, separated according to the instructional pattern which had been employed. Classes taught by specially funded teachers made higher scores than did those taught by District-funded teachers having the services of a specially funded kindergarten specialist. However, neither group made greater gains than did the residual comparison classes in ESEA schools. Comparison classes in non-ESEA schools made the highest prescores and lowest post scores, thus showing the least gain. These were the classes with the highest class size norms. Also, there was considerable variation in scores among and within the schools.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Five of the six specially funded teachers returned questionnaires on the strengths and weaknesses of the program. They specified as strengths: education aides (3 responses), work made easier and more enjoyable (3), opportunity to work with smaller groups (2), consultant services (1), and more instructional materials (1).

They designated weaknesses in the following frequencies: difficulty in obtaining materials (3), necessity of sharing aides and classrooms (2), increased enrollments causing classes to exceed desired norm in size (2), and need for more inservice (1).

Twenty-four kindergarten teachers (including District-funded) who utilized the education aides assigned to ESEA classes were asked to rate the aides in terms of their abilities and usefulness. The 18 teachers who returned completed rating scales rated the aides uniformly high (4.5 to 4.9 on a 5-point scale) in all categories (Table D).

Comments on strengths and weaknesses made by the five administrators were essentially the same as those made by the teachers.

TABLE A

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE BETWEEN KINDERGARTEN GROUPS BY KIND OF PRESCHOOL EXPERIENCE

GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	NAT'L[a] %ILE	ADJUSTED MEAN
Preschool					
ESEA Title I Group	17	34.76	65.82	73	59.98
Comparison Group	60	32.73	67.05	75	62.62
Community Head Start					
ESEA Title I Group	41	24.10	60.05	61	61.60
Comparison Group	66	21.45	59.64	61	63.01
No Previous Preschool					
ESEA Title I Group	286	26.38	58.86	59	58.82
Comparison Group	351	25.97	53.75	48	54.00
					F(5,814) = 10.526**

[a]Entering first-graders

**Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE B

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE - BETWEEN KINDERGARTEN GROUPS BY KIND OF PRESCHOOL EXPERIENCE (MRT SUBTESTS)

GROUP	N	WORD MEANING			MATCHING			NUMBERS		
		PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJ MEAN	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJ MEAN	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJ MEAN
Preschool										
ESEA Title I	17	6.1	10.8	10.6	5.0	9.9	9.3	8.1	15.5	13.4
Comparison	60	6.6	11.7	11.2	3.7	9.5	9.4	6.5	15.2	14.1
Community Head Start										
ESEA Title I	41	5.0	10.3	10.6	3.2	9.8	9.8	4.4	12.5	13.0
Comparison	66	4.9	12.0	12.3	2.3	7.7	8.1	4.3	12.1	12.7
No Previous Preschool										
ESEA Title I	286	5.3	9.9	10.0	3.6	9.1	9.0	5.1	12.5	12.4
Comparison	351	5.8	9.4	9.3	3.3	7.4	7.5	4.8	11.5	11.7
		F(5,814) = 11.786**			F(5,814) = 12.393**			F(5,814) = 4.262**		

GROUP	N	LISTENING			ALPHABET			COPYING		
		PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJ MEAN	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJ MEAN	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJ MEAN
Preschool										
ESEA Title I	17	6.9	11.8	11.4	4.1	9.8	9.7	4.6	8.0	6.6
Comparison	60	7.0	11.3	10.9	6.3	13.4	12.3	2.6	6.2	6.0
Community Head Start										
ESEA Title I	41	6.0	11.2	11.2	3.8	10.0	10.1	1.8	6.7	6.9
Comparison	66	5.2	11.0	11.3	3.0	11.5	12.0	1.6	5.2	5.6
No Previous Preschool										
ESEA Title I	286	5.8	10.4	10.6	4.1	10.5	10.5	2.6	6.6	6.5
Comparison	351	6.2	9.7	9.7	3.9	10.9	11.0	2.0	4.7	4.9
		F(5,814) = 7.454**			F(5,814) = 3.567**			F(5,814) = 14.490**		

**Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE C

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE BETWEEN KINDERGARTEN GROUPS

TEST RESULTS ACCORDING TO TEACHING DESIGN

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	NAT'L[a] %ILE	ADJUSTED MEAN
Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form B, Total Score					
Funded Teachers with Own Classes (class size norm, 21.5)	104	27.98	62.44	65	61.22
District Teachers with Services of Funded Specialist (class size norm, 21.6)	240	25.89	58.00	57	58.33
Comparison Classes in ESEA Schools (class size norm, 22.6)	255	23.55	60.40	61	62.47
Comparison Classes in in non-ESEA Schools (class size norm, 25.7)	222	29.23	51.45	42	49.30

F(3,816) = 47.495**

[a]Entering first-graders

**Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE D

TEACHER RATINGS OF EDUCATION AIDES

ITEM	MEDIAN RATINGS* PRE-KINDERGARTEN N = 40	KINDERGARTEN N = 18	FOLLOW THROUGH N = 15
Rating of aides in terms of:			
- Ability to carry out instructions	4.8	4.8	4.2
- Willingness to carry out instructions	4.9	4.9	4.8
- Conscientiousness (e.g., working six full hours each day)	4.8	4.6	4.8
- Rapport with children	4.9	4.9	4.6
- Rapport with parents	4.9	4.9	4.6
- Rapport with teachers	4.9	4.8	4.8
Extent to which the presence of aides gave teachers more time for professional duties	4.7	4.5	4.0
Helpfulness of aides in working with pupils	4.8	4.8	4.4
Helpfulness of aides in working with parents and other adults	4.6	4.7	4.1
Helpfulness of aides in assisting teachers with other duties	4.6	4.5	4.5

Table D is based on Form 000SA.
*Based on a 1-5 scale.

FOLLOW THROUGH

Abstract

Schools		10
Pupils (Kindergarten)		453
Pupils (First grade)		46
Teachers		20
Aides		30
Other Personnel		10
Approximate Cost	(Title I)	$250,000
	(EOA)	$250,000
	(District)	$ 62,280

Description: Follow Through was designed to build upon and augment, in early primary grades, gains that children had made in a full-year Head Start or other preschool program. Thus, projects began in kindergarten with at least 50% of the children in each project having had a full year of Head Start or a similar preschool experience.

An essential feature of Follow Through projects was active participation by parents in planning and operation. A Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed in each school.

The program involved 10 schools, 453 kindergarten children, 46 first-grade children, 30 teacher aides, 20 teachers, three consultants and a project director, as well as two nurses, two guidance counselors, and two Pupil Services and Attendance counselors, who were assigned specifically to the Follow Through schools. The project also had the benefit of ESEA and District medical, dental, and audiometric services.

Three plans were followed: the Los Angeles Plan, the Bilingual Plan, and the California Process Model.

All plans involved diagnostic-prescriptive techniques, and all stressed sequentially developed experiences in meaningful learning centers, indoors and outdoors. They used a variety of materials in multi-sensory, multi-media approaches.

The Los Angeles Plan brought community people, administrators, teachers, parents, and education aides together as a team to provide learning experiences for children. Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching was based on analysis and understanding of children's educational and behavioral development.

The Bilingual Plan was designed to develop language proficiency, in both Spanish and English, for children whose background was primarily Mexican American. Visual, auditory, and oral perceptive methods and techniques were stressed.

The California Process Model sought pupil development in perceptual-motor, social-emotional, and intellectual academic areas through language experience, linguistics, and phonetic approaches to learning.

Time Intervals: The Follow Through project operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Classes were held from 9 to 2 daily.

Each teacher, assisted by at least one aide, instructed a maximum of 25 children daily.

Activities: The children took part in various indoor and outdoor activities, including individual, small-group, and total-group programs. Guided by the teacher and the teacher aide, they used a variety of materials and equipment. Activities included developing abilities to express thoughts and feelings about artwork, music, and environment; viewing pictures, picture books, films and filmstrips; participating in rhythms and singing; working with geometric figures and measuring containers; solving puzzles; manipulating blocks and various art materials; listening to stories, discussions, songs, records, and tapes; participating in walks; visiting within the school; engaging in gardening projects; playing games; and using apparatus.

Teachers and aides participated in a preservice and inservice education program designed to assist them in fulfillment of the objectives. This included study of child development, review of teaching techniques, evaluation of progress made by the children, and development of materials for classroom use. In addition some of the aides attended classes at UCLA, focusing on career advancement opportunities for paraprofessionals.

The teachers, with consultant assistance, planned for the utilization of volunteers, who attended meetings, participated in discussions, and were trained to assist in the program. Before, during, and after class periods, volunteers were helped to develop their interests and to increase their ability to make effective use of their time with the children.

Objectives:

- To raise the median gain of project participants commensurate with the time span between pre and post administration of standardized and nonstandardized tests
- To improve the verbal functioning level of the children
- To increase the children's expectations of success in school

Evaluation Strategy: The Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT) was used pre and post for all kindergarten children in Follow Through and comparison classes. In addition, the Bilingual Plan participants underwent a separate evaluation by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL). First-grade children took the MRT as a pretest but used the Cooperative Primary Reading Test as a posttest.

Follow Through pupils were compared with (1) comparison groups in their own schools and (2) various kindergarten groups in other schools.

Each model was assessed separately, and a comparison of the three models was made. Locally developed questionnaires were completed by staff members and parents.

Results: Pupils in the California Process Model displayed the steepest learning slope, followed closely by those in the Bilingual Plan, then by the Los Angeles Plan.

Follow Through children in both the California and Bilingual plans scored significantly higher than comparison children in their own schools on the Metropolitan Readiness Test, and all Follow Through children scored significantly higher than did comparison groups in schools without Follow Through programs.

Although the Follow Through groups exceeded their comparison groups in MRT gains, they did not appear to achieve as well as ESEA kindergarten classes or their within-school comparison classes, when it is considered that Follow Through youngsters had twice as long a school day.

MRT scores showed that, in the case of the Bilingual and Los Angeles plans, preschool and Head Start experience made no difference. Higher achievement found in the California Process Model for youngsters with preschool experience was affected by scores at one school.

Test results for first-grade Follow Through pupils and their comparison groups showed that neither group made any gains. However, these findings are subject to qualification, as is explained in the detailed evaluation report of this component.

All of the 170 parents who completed questionnaires recommended continuation of the program, and nearly half of the parents added supportive comments.

Teachers, consultants, and administrators commented favorably on parent participation, teacher aides, and auxiliary services.

Teacher ratings indicated that aides were helpful to the teachers, parents, and pupils. Comments and recommendations made by eight Follow Through teachers about their aides indicated that the aides were competent, cooperative, responsible, outstanding workers.

Seven out of 10 Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) chairmen reported membership in their schools totaling 165. PAC members stated they attended an average of 10 meetings during the year and that the membership determined the PAC activities. They rated the PAC adequate in fulfilling its objectives.

Nurses served practically all Follow Through children. Health Services reports indicated correction of 59 of 123 health defects detected. Counselors reported 242 cases closed in their effort to meet problems of Follow Through youngsters; and Guidance and Psychological Services showed 197 psychological studies, 207 pupils counseled, 790 conferences, and 260 hours of conferences held.

Conclusions: Data at hand would indicate the three plans rank as follows, in order of effectiveness: California Process Model, Bilingual Plan, Los Angeles Plan. Detailed inspection of the data by class and school, however, leads to the conclusion that apparent differences may owe more to variation between teachers and schools than to variation between programs.

A notable conclusion is that, for pupils studied, preschool experience could not be said to have any effect on scores obtained on the MRT.

The apparent effectiveness of Follow Through programs, when compared to "traditional" 2.5-hour kindergarten programs, must be interpreted with caution.

Positive comments by administrators, consultants, teachers, parents, and PAC members indicated enthusiasm and commitment to the project.

Data collected on Follow Through health, psychological, and social supportive services indicated that a successful effort had been made to meet the needs of the children.

Recommendations: Consider this year's results as baseline data, and continue assessment throughout the primary grades.

Investigate why youngsters do not sustain gains which are made in preschool programs.

Compare effectiveness of Follow Through programs with a larger sample of "traditional" 2.5-hour kindergarten programs in target and non-target schools.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Abstract

Pupils (ESEA Title I)	2200
(Non-ESEA)	2200
Schools (ESEA Title I)	42
(Non-ESEA)	58
Staff	
Teachers (ESEA Title I)	62
(Non-ESEA)	62
Coordinator	1
Consultants	3
Approximate Cost	$183,041

Program for Interschool Enrichment

Description: The Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE) was designed to provide opportunity for children, grades 1-6, from differing ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds to work together toward greater academic achievement, better interpersonal relationships, and more positive self-concepts. Selected classes from Title I schools, including some student councils, were paired with selected classes from non-Title I schools as a basis for the project. At the beginning of the school year, teachers of these partner classes jointly developed an instructional theme in student government or in a subject area of their choice, such as language arts, science, or social studies.

During the year each pair of classes met at one or the other of their schools and/or took field trips together as the principal medium for the learning activities. These meetings were intended to provide a basis for communication and mutual problem solving and for development of interpersonal relationships.

Parents were invited to attend teacher inservice meetings, to share in planning, and to assist teachers with class meetings at schools or on field trips. Substitute teachers were provided so that participating teachers could attend as many as possible of the seven all-day staff development meetings which were held during the year.

Time Intervals: Each pair of PIE classes was scheduled to meet one full day on alternate weeks between September 1969 and June 1970. Staff development meetings for teachers were held about once a month.

Activities: Children in grades one through six worked with children from differing ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds on science, literature, mathematics, art, social studies, music, and student-government themes.

Activities for each instructional theme, planned to promote specific learning in that subject area, included research projects, field trips for science specimen

collection and identification, art workshops in photographic line design, sculpturing, silk screen process, texture study, group painting, collage construction, opera study, assembly line production, and joint class culminations, as well as attendance at opera rehearsals and performances, and visits to City Council, County Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Court House, and consular offices.

Written, taped, pictorial, and filmed reactions to the experiences were exchanged between classes and between individuals in order to strengthen self-image, build interpersonal relationships, improve communication skills, and reinforce cognitive learning.

Student-produced stories and reports and photographs of the participants were printed in bi-semester issues of "P.I.E. Happenings," a four-page newspaper that was distributed to all persons involved in the program.

Junior Arts Center Workshop and the UCLA Opera Workshop were typical community resources. Resource personnel from both the paired schools' local communities and the community-at-large contributed to the program.

Other Intergroup Activities

In addition to the PIE activities directly affecting 42 Title I schools, intergroup programs in all 55 schools were designed to provide multicultural experience and improve attitudes toward other ethnic groups. Almost 53,500 participants were involved, with the activities conducted at irregular intervals throughout the school year.

In 41 schools enrichment journeys or exchange visits by classes other than those involved in PIE activities were reported, and 24 schools described participation in programs to recognize such special days or events as Negro History Week and Cinco de Mayo.

Other approaches to better intergroup relations mentioned by individual schools included use of films or other audio-visual materials to provide opportunity to contrast and compare values (mentioned by 30 schools); use of library displays and library resources (19); auditorium displays, assemblies, or assembly recognition to individuals and/or classrooms (17); school clubs, including interest groups in intercultural relations, industrial arts, careers, journalism, and charm (12); activities to develop self-image and self-respect (9); the tutorial program (7); ethnic studies (6); art, dance, or music presentations (5); group discussions (5); workshops (4); speakers (4); displays (4); and home visitation (2).

Approaches to the development of understanding and friendly, cooperative, respectful relationships which were mentioned by at least one school each were parent counseling, use of community resource people, and presentation of an on-site college course.

Objective:

- To change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience

Evaluation Strategy: Using results of pre-post administration of the locally devised Pupil Attitude Rating Scale (PARS), several comparisons involving such variables as school ethnicity, partner class ethnicity, experimental-control status, and/or Title I versus non-Title I status were made. The six concepts reflected in the PARS were separately analyzed with respect to the above types of comparisons.

The same types of comparisons were made from data from the Teacher Periodic Evaluation Report. This instrument was completed three times during the year by participating teachers.

Parents and administrators also rated various aspects of the program.

Questionnaires to be completed by teachers and administrators were developed and used to evaluate the extent and effectiveness of other programs or activities in intergroup relations.

Results: Analysis of data from pre-post administration of the Pupil Attitude Rating Scale indicates that changes of attitude for PIE pupils were negligible while attitude scores of comparison groups declined. Since the difference between pre and post scores was miniscule, changes in attitude cannot be considered meaningful for either group.

Three times during the school year component teachers were asked to estimate the attitudes of their pupils with respect to other ethnic groups and also to estimate the effectiveness of the last PIE event attended. In December 1969 and May 1970 PIE teachers estimated pupil attitudes and the effectiveness of PIE events in (1) enriching pupil background, (2) increasing knowledge of subject matter, and (3) developing positive attitudes toward others. Analysis of their responses showed that teachers of Caucasian (Anglo)-Negro matched classes rated pupils significantly higher (.05 level of significance for item 1 and .01 level for item 2) than did teachers of Caucasian (Mexican American)-Negro matched classes. No differences were found on item 3.

Conclusions: Teachers of Negro classes paired with Caucasian (Anglo) children were more confident as to the contribution of PIE events both toward pupil background enrichment and toward pupil knowledge of subject matter than were teachers of Caucasian (Mexican American) and Negro matched classes.

Pupil ratings of other ethnic groups showed little change at the time of the posttest.

Recommendation: Continue the program, in view of its acceptance by parents, teachers, and administrators.

Assessment of Intergroup Activities Other than PIE

School journey tours and provision of ethnic studies centers in the classroom or library were common intergroup activities in the schools, as were provision of assembly speakers or programs promoting intercultural understanding.

Reactions of teachers and administrators indicated that effective work was being done in a variety of intergroup approaches and activities.

Administrators felt that recruitment and employment of minority people from the community played an important part in improving intergroup relations.

Involvement of still larger numbers of pupils, parents, teachers, and administrators in an increased program of intergroup/intercultural activites will benefit schools and the community.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Detailed Report

Program for Interschool Enrichment

Attainment of the component objective was evaluated according to the following indicators: scores on a locally devised pupil attitude scale; teacher ratings of program effectiveness, as well as their estimates of pupil attitude toward other ethnic groups; questionnaire responses by parents; and open-end comments by administrators. Pupils completed rating scales at the beginning and end of the school year, and teachers submitted estimates and ratings three times during the year. Parents and administrators completed questionnaires at midyear.

Objective: To change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience.

The pupil attitude rating scale was completed pre and post by about 630 of the approximately 4400 pupils in the program and by approximately 515 comparison pupils in Title I and non-Title I schools.

It was originally planned to have approximately 50% of all classes in the component, other than K-3 classes, complete the pupil attitude rating scale, pre and post. Because of objections to the instrument, however, classes in schools in the East Area were not required to complete the form.

Table A shows the differences between pre and post means obtained with the Pupil Attitude Rating Scale (PARS) for PIE and comparison groups.

Scores on the PARS declined between the pre and posttest administrations for all groups (except the Title I PIE group which gained .04 of a point). Changes of attitude for PIE pupils were negligible, while a statistical test indicated scores of comparison groups declined significantly. No differences exceeded 0.65 mean raw score points however, and cannot be considered as meaningful in terms of changes in attitude for any of the groups.

Three times during the year component teachers rated the attitudes of their pupils toward other ethnic groups, and also the effectiveness of the most recent PIE event in assisting pupils to (a) broaden and enrich their background, (b) increase their knowledge of subject matter, and (c) develop positive attitudes toward children from other ethnic groups. Except for the following, no significant differences were found among the opinions of several groups of teachers:

(1) A comparison of responses regarding background enrichment received at midyear with those received at the end of the year showed that teachers of matched Caucasian (Anglo) and Negro classes rated their pupils significantly higher (at the .05 level of significance) than did teachers of matched Caucasian (Mexican American) and Negro classes.

(2) A comparison of responses regarding knowledge of subject matter received at the beginning of the year with those received at the end of the year showed that teachers of matched Caucasian (Anglo) and

Negro classes rated their pupils significantly higher (at the .05 level of significance) than did teachers of matched Caucasian (Mexican American) and Negro classes.

In their three evaluations the teachers commented on the program. Their comments, some of which probably were duplicated, were, in order of frequency: program should be continued to determine effectiveness (21 comments); allow more school time for planning (11); visits to schools are more effective than visits to other places (7); reduce number of trips (too much time away from academic work) (7).

Parents of children involved in the component completed questionnaires rating the program. Their responses on 502 returns are shown in Tables B-1 and B-2. Table B-1 indicates little difference among responses from parents of children in various grades. Approximately 96% of the parents thought the program had been helpful to their children, would improve intergroup feelings, and should be continued. The tables also reveal that approximately 77% of the parents received explanation of the program before it began but that relatively few attended joint meetings or trips.

Comparing responses by parents of children in schools categorized by predominant enrollment from one or another of the ethnic groups, Table B-2 shows comparatively few differences in responses among these groups. The greatest difference was between the Caucasian (Anglo) and Negro group in response to the question, "Was the program explained to you before it began?" Negro parents (69%) answered in the affirmative, compared with 89% of the Caucasian (Anglo) parents.

In open-end comments, administrators praised the program, attributing its success to factors such as parental and teacher enthusiasm and effective organization of the activity.

Strengths and Weaknesses:

Strengths are evidenced in the questionnaire responses of administrators and parents, most of whom regarded the program very favorably. Most felt that PIE had done much to improve relations between ethnic groups.

An attempt was made to assess the extent to which the component objective was achieved. Certain deficiencies in the evaluation research design and/or the operational program, however, prevented ready determination of this in terms of pupil response.

The instrument used to obtain pupil attitudes toward other ethnic groups was not validated, nor were any reliability studies effected.

In addition, pupils in Title I schools in the Mexican American community were excused from completing the pupil attitude rating scale, thereby seriously affecting assessment of attitude change by all participants.

Other Intergroup Activities

Administrative reports of intergroup relations activities, based on responses from 48 of the 50 principals surveyed to a questionnaire on Administrative Evaluation of Supportive Services, are shown in Table C.

The principals indicated that the most common activities were school journey tours and the provision of ethnic studies centers in classrooms or libraries. Recruitment and employment of minority people from the community ranked third as an activity mentioned, though it did not involve as many participants.

An estimated 74,000 persons were involved in these three activities, and assembly speakers or programs promoting intercultural understanding involved more than 21,600.

A number of principals added evaluative comments concerning intergroup activities. Nineteen of these comments were positive, three negative.

Typical statements were:

On ethnic studies and assembly programs --

> Rich variety of materials available.
>
> Inspirational speakers have helped raise self-image and provide new career insights.

On minority employment --

> A most effective program! Education aides and part-time community workers are invaluable to our program.

On school journey tours --

> Very effective!
>
> Extra trips (Title I ESEA funded) have been very beneficial this year for intergroup relations.

The negative comments tended to deal with specifics. They included these statements by the principals concerning parent meetings and minority employment:

> Unless a program or meeting is at night, we get a very small turnout. If it is at night, people won't come to hear about and discuss vital issues but will come out to hear a celebrity or be entertained.
>
> Impossible to get them paid without an act of congress metaphorically and actually!!!

Reactions by teachers also indicated that effective work in intergroup relations had been done, and comments predicted that it will continue to be done as parents, school personnel, and all participants become more aware of its importance.

Teacher reports, summarized in Table D, showed that school journey tours were the most common activity. Also frequent were provision of ethnic studies centers in classrooms or libraries, development of curriculum materials, and provision of assembly speakers or programs promoting intercultural understanding.

Sensitivity training, sister school programs, school newspaper exchange, other exchange of pupils and/or teachers, a speaker's bureau, and other approaches to improve intergroup understanding also received mention.

Seventeen teachers added open-end comments concerning intergroup activities, almost all emphasizing the importance of such programs. Among their statements were:

> Our school is not doing much or as much as they should for intergroup relations.
>
> We should all be able to have pupils exchange with schools in different areas. We have no opportunity to get to know children of different ethnic compositions, and therefore since our children are victims of de facto segregation, they have all kinds of built in fears and prejudices of the "unknown." . . . We have a sequential program of ethnic studies in the classroom.

TABLE A

SCORES ON THE PUPIL ATTITUDE RATING SCALE
FOR PIE AND COMPARISON PUPILS

GROUP	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	DIFFERENCE	t RATIO
Title I Pupils				
PIE	18.19	18.23	.04	0.269
Comparison	18.59	17.94	-.65	-4.159**
Non-Title I Pupils				
PIE	19.41	19.12	-.29	-1.535
Comparison	19.02	18.71	-.31	-2.182*
Title I and Non-Title I Pupils				
PIE	18.87	18.72	-.15	-0.945
Comparison	18.83	18.36	-.47	-4.242**

Table A is based on sums of means for six concepts, each on a 1-4 scale, minimum to maximum.

**Significant at .001 level.

TABLE B-1

PARENT REACTIONS - VARIOUS GRADES

ITEM	Grades 1 & 2		Grades 3 & 4		Grades 5 & 6		Student Council Members	
Approximate number of evaluation forms sent	210		350		280		210	
Number of completed forms returned	95		186		128		93	
Approximate response	45%		53%		46%		44%	
QUESTION	RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGE							
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you think the program was helpful to your child?	98	02	94	06	99	01	96	04
Did your child tell you about the things done by the two groups?	87	13	96	04	96	04	96	04
Do you think that doing these things together will make both groups feel better toward each other?	93	07	95	05	96	04	100	00
Was the program explained to you before it began?	71	29	84	16	76	24	73	27
Did you attend any joint meetings when the two groups worked together?	18	82	21	79	15	85	07	93
Did you attend any of the joint trips to various points of interest?	28	72	17	83	19	81	08	92
Would you like this program to be continued?	97	03	94	06	98	02	98	02

Table A-1 is based on Form 008P.

TABLE B-2

PARENT REACTIONS - VARIOUS ETHNIC GROUPS

ITEM	CAUCASIAN (ANGLO)		CAUCASIAN (MEXICAN AMERICAN)		NEGRO	
Approximate number of evaluation forms sent	420		280		350	
Number of completed forms returned	207		121		174	
Approximate response	49%		43%		50%	
QUESTION	RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGE					
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you think the program was helpful to your child?	94	06	97	03	99	01
Did your child tell you about the things done by the two groups?	95	05	96	04	93	07
Do you think that doing these things together will make both groups feel better toward each other?	93	07	97	03	09	02
Was the program explained to you before it began?	89	11	70	30	69	31
Did you attend any joint meetings when the two groups worked together?	20	80	13	87	13	87
Did you attend any of the joint trips to various points of interest?	20	80	14	86	17	83
Would you like this program to be continued?	93	07	97	03	99	01

Table B-2 is based on Form 008P.

TABLE C

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS OF PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	Schools Reporting Activity	Schools Estimating Number of Participants	Estimated Number of Participants
Provision of ethnic studies center(s) in classroom or library	44	41	37,187
School journey tours, excluding PIE	41	40	36,019
Recruitment and employment of minority people from the community	41	39	787
Assembly speakers or programs promoting intercultural understanding	31	29	21,622
Development of curriculum materials dealing with contributions of minority groups	30	18	410*
Sensitivity training for staff members	28	23	925
Sister-school program	9	9	722
Exchange of pupils and/or teachers with schools of different ethnic compositions, not including PIE	9	8	402
School newspaper exchange or speaker's bureau	7	1	20
Other approaches being used to improve intergroup relations:			
Home visitation, tutoring, provision of an after-school laboratory	5	3	74
Conferences, human relations workshops, or community meetings by school, or with Office of Urban Affairs assistance	3	1	75
Use of volunteers from other ethnic groups	3	3	17
Coordinating assemblies with and use of tutors from neighboring parochial school	1	1	200
Use of library resources	1	1	60
Provision of ethnic studies for staff	1	1	55
Group guidance and case conferences	1	1	5

Table C is based on Form 000A-1. N = 48 administrators responding

*As far as possible, figure for participants excludes pupils using materials.

TABLE D

ACTIVITIES REPORTED BY TEACHERS

ACTIVITY	FREQUENCY
Please indicate all intergroup relations programs in which you or your pupils have taken part this year:	
School journey tours	624
Provision of ethnic studies center(s) in classroom or library	326
Development of curriculum materials	252
Assembly speakers or programs promoting intercultural understanding	189
Sensitivity training	90
Sister school program	49
School newspaper exchange	28
Other exchange of pupils and/or teacher with schools of different ethnic composition, not including PIE	25
Speaker's bureau	19
Other approach(es) to bettering intergroup relations	88

Table D is based on Form 000T-1. Maximum N = 1160

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Abstract

Parents	Approx. 25,100
Schools	55
Approximate Cost	$200,818

Description: Parent involvement activities were designed to develop mutual understanding, improve education, and help schools more effectively meet the needs of youngsters. School personnel, parents, and representatives of community groups were brought together in School-Community Advisory Councils, Parent-Teacher groups, and a wide variety of projects and activities.

Time Intervals: More than 25,000 parents of youngsters in the target schools took part in parent involvement activities, which extended from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. School-Community Advisory Councils were also active in planning for the summer sessions, July 6 through August 14, 1970. Parent involvement continued during this period.

Activities: Parents and representatives of community groups became members of School-Community Advisory Councils in each target school. They joined teachers, administrators, education aides, and other school personnel in plans and projects to help schools and communities work together.

Methods or programs to promote parent involvement which were listed or described in school summaries were adult classes and/or workshops (in reading, mathematics, parent education, English as a second language - ESL, or other subjects), mentioned by 32 schools; parental visits to schools for Open House or to participate in other special programs (27 references); parent volunteers (20); education aides (17); PTA (17); parent conferences (16); tutorial programs (14); block parents (13); and room mothers (5).

Descriptions also indicated that parents accompanied youngsters on school journeys in at least 13 schools and were involved with assisting in all Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, Follow Through, and Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE) classes. Also mentioned were the following, with the number of descriptions indicated after each item: newsletter, bulletin, or newspaper publicity (10); social gatherings (10); demonstrations of teaching (7); classroom visitation and observation (7); speakers and discussions (7); grade level meetings (5); projects to combat vandalism (5); club activities for pupils (4); meetings concerning individual projects (3); and programs to better utilize community resources (2).

Objectives:

- To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants
- To improve communications among school, home, and community resources
- To assist parents in understanding the educational program of the school

Evaluation Strategy: This is reported in the evaluation of ESEA instructional activities and specifically in the evaluation of programs in reading and mathematics. Standardized tests were used to measure academic achievement levels of Title I participants.

At midyear, rating scales and questionnaires to parents, members of School-Community Advisory Councils, teachers, and administrators were used to assess the effectiveness of parent involvement activities. (This January assessment was not repeated at the end of the school year, so results may not necessarily present a true picture of the whole year.)

Results: Responses from parents showed that more than 40% of 1882 respondents had joined school groups, more than half had visited their child's school or classroom, and almost 96% felt that their youngsters took pride in the school. However, almost 25% had not received letters, folders, or other information concerning the school program; 35% had not received information concerning their youngster by midyear; and almost 75% had not seen newspaper accounts concerning the youngster's school or its pupils.

Responses from School-Community Advisory Council chairmen and members in January indicated the feeling, at that time, that committees were properly composed and organized, were working effectively, were considering important topics, and were carrying through successful projects or activities.

Teachers (1160 responses, a 55.9% return) reported parent conferences and meetings and a variety of parent involvement activities. They rated school work effective, though not as effective as it might be, in improving communications and parent understanding.

Principals of 48 schools listed PTA or parent group memberships as ranging from 5% to 59% of school enrollment; indicated the work of parents as paid employees and volunteer aides; and reported that parent classes in mathematics, reading, and other subjects were offered.

Conclusions: Parent interest in involvement with the schools is increasing, with opportunities for parent-school-community interaction being provided. All concerned have benefited.

Recommendations: Continue and increase efforts to involve parents and improve communications among school, home, and community resources.

Greater parent involvement might be obtained if there were reimbursement for child care and payment for inservice.

Both school personnel and parents have noted the need for in-depth orientation to compensatory education programs.

The need for greater effort in informing the media of school activities can be inferred.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Detailed Report

Midyear ratings of component effectiveness by parents, representatives of community groups who served on Advisory Councils, and staff members provided a measure of the degree of attainment of component objectives.

Objective: To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants.

Effects of parent involvement on the academic achievement of youngsters are indirect; consequently, attempts at measurement of these effects on achievement cannot be regarded as necessarily valid or reliable. However, some degree of improved academic achievement measured in the instructional components reasonably may be attributed to increasing parent involvement.

Objectives: To improve communications among school, home, and community resources.
To assist parents in understanding the educational program of the school.

Responses by parents of second graders in half the schools and of fifth graders in the other half (1882 returns from 8010 forms sent to schools) indicated that slightly more than 40% of the respondents were active in groups such as the PTA, advisory councils, men's clubs, or room mothers.

Table A shows that less than 12% of the parents responding had "made an attempt to become active in school groups and been discouraged," that most of the respondents had received information concerning their children and the school program, and that more than half had visited their youngster's school or classroom.

Almost 96% of the respondents believed that their children took pride in the school. However, only slightly more than 25% said they had seen stories about the school or its pupils in local or metropolitan newspapers.

Of the more than 480 responses submitted in open-end comments, suggestions, or recommendations, 15 (or 3%) of the statements could be considered negative to some degree; only one was extremely negative (a statement that a principal did not want teachers or parents to have any "real" say about the schools).

Specific endorsements of the school staff or pupil programs were offered by 149 respondents (31%). Another 89 responses (18.5%) were a general endorsement of involvement, an offer of help, or a request for information. Other parents said that they worked (94 responses), cared for other children at home (41), were ill (25), or attended school themselves (14).

Thirty parents sought more homework for their children, while 14 asked for more "old fashioned" discipline, stricter standards, or more supervision. Fifteen respondents criticized high lunch costs or the lack of a cafeteria.

Among typical responses:

> I am a working mother. I do not have the time to visit the classroom as often as I would like to. I am very happy to know that she has a teacher that is very concerned about his pupils.
>
> I believe if more parents were to visit or become more interested in . . . school there would be a better understanding between the school and home, then this would help the child to understand that the two are working together to help him, the child.

And, interestingly phrased, if less typical:

> I am too busy seeing to the welfare of my children to become involved in groups at school.

Advisory Councils

School-Community Advisory Council chairmen from 30 schools (50 questionnaires were mailed) reported memberships ranging from 8 to 35 in size, with an average membership of 20, distributed as follows:

	Percent
Parents from the school	51.4
Parents working as aides	12.1
Community leaders	4.9
Teachers	21.7
Administrators	6.4
Other school personnel	3.5

Eighteen of the chairmen (75% of those who responded) considered the number of school people "about right," while five said there were "too few," and one said "too many."

Twenty-six chairmen felt that the school was making effective use of the committee as an advisory group; four indicated that it was not.

At midyear 393 Advisory Council members of 958 to whom the forms were mailed returned a School-Community Advisory Council Questionnaire. Their feelings concerning meetings and activities are summarized in Table B.

These respondents reported attendance at meetings and informal contacts on Advisory Council business (phone calls or conversations outside regular meetings), as shown below:

Attending	Number of Members
1 meeting	23
2-4 meetings	142
5-7 meetings	110
8-10 meetings	20
More than 10 meetings	6

Making	Number of Members
1 contact	16
2-4 contacts	77
5-7 contacts	51
8-10 contacts	35
More than 10 contacts	66

Asked if they were gaining new facts or new ideas about the school, 368 respondents said "Yes"; 17 checked "No." These committee members indicated by 348 to 32 that there was fair chance for discussion without one or two people taking up most of the time, and by 363 to 13 that group members worked well together.

The Advisory Council respondents indicated overwhelmingly that committee members determined the number of meetings to be held and the topics or subjects to be covered. The topics they considered important (800 separate responses) and the successful activities described in open-end responses (346) could be classified under the headings of school programs, school policies, school-community interests, and council and community.

Teacher and Administrator Reactions

Responses from 1160 teachers (of a possible 2076) indicated that 352 (30%) had had opportunity to attend School-Community Advisory Council meetings, and 788 had not. By January, 336 of the teachers had attended one PTA meeting, 262 had attended two, 147 had attended three, 47 had attended four, 19 had attended five, and 8 had attended more than five meetings (presumably including committee meetings or meetings of officers).

Table C shows that teacher respondents felt that there was more parent involvement/participation this year than in the 1968-69 school year. It also indicates that they rated the school's work effective in improving communications among school, home, and community (3.5 median on a 5-point, Very Ineffective - Very Effective scale), and in assisting parents to understand the educational program of the school (3.5 median).

Teachers were asked to report and describe their participation in school programs or activities that involved parents with the school. They most frequently mentioned music and other programs for special occasions, and Open House or Back to School Night. More than half of the 1160 respondents reported participation in at least one activity. The frequency of their mention of activities is shown in Table D.

Extra comments and recommendations concerning parent involvement were made by 12 teachers and were divided almost evenly in expression of positive and negative reactions. Representative statements included:

> Parent conferences are almost impossible due to time limitations . . . .
>
> Parents do not participate by visiting classrooms and some show little concern about their child's progress and our efforts. Most of them are involved and depend upon teacher to do what she thinks is best.

> The usual program of any school and year brings parents and school together. The link is the child . . . . As long as their child is gaining they are satisfied, proud, interested. This is all the public relations any school needs. . . . "Parent involvement" will not help but smaller classes will. Cut down class size.
>
> Parent involvement in school is definitely increasing.
>
> I feel parent participation is vital and am looking forward to the day when we make it mandatory.

Principals of 48 schools reported PTA (sometimes called parents' club or parents' group) memberships ranging from 47 to 600 (average 275) and representing from 5 to 59% of total school enrollment (median, 24%). Forty-four of the principals provided figures which showed that 594 parents (an average of 13.5 per school) were active as officers or committee members in these parent groups.

The groups had scheduled from 4 to 10 meetings for the year, and attendance for meetings from September to January ranged from 10 to 400, with an average attendance of 80 and a median of 50.

Principals' responses to an Administrative Evaluation of Supportive Services questionnaire showed that 463 parents from the community were working as paid employees in 44 schools, an average of 10 or 11 employees per school. Several schools did not have volunteer aides, but 34 principals reported a total of 953 such volunteers in their schools, spending approximately 1275 hours per week helping in classrooms, offices, the library, or other areas.

In 19 of 45 schools reporting, workshops in mathematics had been set up for parents, with enrollments ranging from 4 to 300 (median 20). There were 24 schools with such workshops in reading (identical to mathematics workshops in range of enrollment and median). Eighteen principals reported classes for Spanish-speaking parents, ranging in enrollment from 12 to 130. Ten principals said that their school had offered or was currently offering adult classes studying children's motivations and behavior. Enrollments reported ranged from 10 to 34.

Basic education, sewing, health and nursing, arts and crafts, kindergarten, pre-kindergarten, English, and Americanization were subjects for other workshops. Such workshops were reported by 23 administrators.

Conclusions

The number of parents involved, and the reactions of parents, School-Community Advisory Council members, teachers, and administrators indicate that the Parent Involvement component is meeting the objectives of improving communications among school, home, and community resources, and of assisting parents to understand the educational program of the school.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Almost one-fourth of the parents who responded at midyear had not received letters, folders, or other information concerning the school program.

Need for greater effort in informing the media concerning school activities may be inferred from the responses of almost three-fourths of the parents, who had not seen stories regarding their youngster's school or its pupils in the newspapers.

A need for continued effort in involving parents is apparent in the teacher estimates, which placed the amount of parent involvement this year, as compared to last year, at a 3.6 median on a 5-point scale, and which rated effectiveness of the school's program in improving communications among school, home, and community resources at 3.5 median.

TABLE A

PARENT RESPONSES

ITEM	PERCENTAGE YES	NO	N
Are you a member of any school-connected group, such as PTA, Parent Advisory Council, Men's Club, Room Mothers?	41.3	58.7	1788
If you are not active in any school groups, have you made an attempt to become active and been discouraged?	11.8	88.2	1572
Has the school sent home letters, folders, or other information concerning its program this year?	76.3	23.7	1756
Has it sent home information concerning your youngster?	65.0	35.0	1710
Have you visited the school or your youngster's classroom this year?	54.9	45.1	1825
Have you seen stories about your youngster's school or its pupils in local or metropolitan newspapers?	26.6	73.4	1725
Do you feel that your youngster takes pride in his or her school?	95.9	4.1	1767

Table A is based on Form 009P. Maximum N = 1882

TABLE B

ADVISORY COUNCIL RATINGS

ITEM	FREQUENCY			MEDIAN
	Little 1	Somewhat 2	Much 3	
Extent or degree to which:				
Meetings were interesting	3	46	337	2.9
Topics were relevant and important	6	70	311	2.9
The group is accomplishing its purposes	18	168	182	2.5
The school values committee ideas and opinions	18	118	241	2.7
Understanding of specially-funded (Title I) programs in the school has been improved as a result of the meetings	43	120	217	2.6

	Does Not Apply 0	Not Helpful 1	Helpful 2	Very Helpful 3	
Helpfulness to the Council member of:					
Discussions in the group	9	9	200	156	2.4 *
Informal gatherings before or after meetings or at a break	43	15	192	107	2.2
Guest speakers	55	16	121	146	2.5
Field trips	187	6	46	75	2.6
Movies, filmstrips, tape recordings, etc.	162	14	70	56	2.3
Visiting schools	155	2	61	91	2.6

Table B is based on Form 009B. Maximum N = 393

*Medians exclude "Does Not Apply" responses.

TABLE C

TEACHER EVALUATION

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE					MEDIAN
		Much Less 1	2	Same 3	4	Much More 5	
Please estimate the amount of parent involvement/participation this year, as compared to last	795	5.9	3.1	36.5	29.1	25.4	3.6
How effective is the school's program:		Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Very Effective 5	
in improving communications among school, home, and community resources?	1115	3.8	10.0	37.5	31.9	16.8	3.5
in assisting parents to understand the educational program of the school?	1118	3.6	10.8	35.3	33.7	16.6	3.5

Table C is based on Form 000T-1. Maximum N = 1160

TABLE D

TEACHER ACTIVITIES

ITEM	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Participation of or with parents in:	
Music programs, and programs for special occasions such as Halloween or Christmas	272
Open House or Back to School Night	265
PTA or other parent group meetings	84
Field trips	39
Advisory committee meetings	36
Grade level meetings	27
Class parties or picnic	26
Workshops	24
Dinners, luncheons, or other social events	22
Reading programs	20
Coffee Hour or Teas	14
Ladies Night, Charm Class	12
Art Festival	11
Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE)	11
Home calls	10
Service as faculty representative	8
Miscellaneous	8

N = 569 teachers (of 1160 respondents)

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Abstract

Staff Personnel	
Certificated	2771
Aides	690
Schools	55
Approximate Cost	$488,101

Description: Elementary schools in the ESEA Title I program made use of district, area, local school, and community resources to offer preservice and inservice activities. Their reports indicate that 2745 certificated personnel, 690 education aides, and 26 professional experts participated in this staff development.

District and area offices arranged inservice programs for counselors, teacher librarians, Follow Through personnel, Pre-Kindergarten teachers, reading and mathematics consultants, and teachers of Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE) classes. Principals, vice-principals, resource teachers, consultants or specialists, regular classroom teachers, and advisory committees helped to plan and organize staff development programs at individual schools.

Time Intervals: Staff development activities began with preservice meetings in September 1969; continued throughout the school year; and, with an intensive program involving parents, extended into the summer session, July 6 through August 14, 1970.

Activities: Responses from schools indicated that several activities played a part in staff development. These included grade level meetings (38 mentions), workshops (32), demonstrations (20), general faculty meetings (14), subject or special interest meetings (11), programs for aides (9), and inservice activities designed to meet special needs (9).

Varying according to needs of the local school, component activities also included presentations by guest speakers; group discussion; class visitation and observation; and the use of films, filmstrips, TV and videotape, or other audio-visual materials.

Consideration was given to methods of improving self-image in pupils, introduction of new curriculum materials, development of behavioral objectives, use of diagnostic techniques, and preparation and use of profiles.

Objectives:

- To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants

- To provide inservice education
    a. Improve understanding of the effects of poverty on children
    b. Improve intergroup and intercultural understanding
    c. Improve teaching skills in specific instructional areas
    d. Improve skills and use of paraprofessionals (e.g., education aides)
    e. Improve skills and use of supportive personnel (e.g., counselors)
    f. Improve skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs
    g. Develop curricular innovations

Evaluation Strategy: As indicated in the evaluation of instructional activities in reading and mathematics, standardized tests were used to measure academic achievement levels of Title I participants.

Rating scales and questionnaires to be completed by teachers and administrators were developed at midyear to assess effectiveness of staff development activities in general after five school months. Where content of programs for specific instructional or supportive service groups (e.g., English as a Second Language, Pupil Services and Attendance) was known in time to permit preparation of evaluation instruments, such programs were evaluated within the framework of the specific component.

Results: Teachers (N=1160) assigned relatively low ratings to inservice effects on skills or attitudes, considering inservice least effective in improving their understanding of the effects of poverty on children. They judged inservice most effective in improvement of teaching skills in specific areas, and in improvement of skills and use of paraprofessionals (e.g., education aides).

However, most comments on inservice were positive. More experienced teachers tended to rate it more highly than did teachers with fewer years of experience; and various groups, such as counselors, reading and mathematics teachers, and aides, expressed a desire for more inservice time.

Teachers and consultants asked for in-depth study in subject areas such as mathematics and reading.

Conclusions: Flexibility for local schools to meet individual needs and time for planning are important elements of successful staff development programs.

It follows that programs with the best chance of success would be those developed, and revised as needed, by the participants, the aides, teachers, administrators, parents, and everyone involved.

Recommendations: With provisions for joint planning, and adequate time to accomplish this, geographical clustering of schools for inservice could result in more efficient use of consultant and/or guest speaker time and easier coordination and exchange of ideas among nearby schools.

In-depth study to improve instruction in academic areas, ongoing sessions tailored to the needs of project participants in the local school, and emphasis on parent interaction are in keeping with compensatory education guidelines.

Team instruction, a new experience for most teachers, would be a suitable subject for inservice sessions.

Inservice for aides should be increased and should focus upon the grade level and subjects taught in the class to which the individual aide is assigned. Cooperative involvement of teachers and aides in this inservice would maximize relevance of the training to the tasks to be performed.

Payment of aides for local inservice or the granting of college credits has been recommended in independent evaluation of the aide program.

Evaluation of inservice sessions planned for specific groups would be facilitated if content for meetings could be clearly delineated in advance and if there were sufficient lead time to permit preparation of instruments designed to evaluate the specific inservice session or sessions.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Detailed Report

Teachers and administrators described and evaluated staff development procedures and accomplishments which, by increasing staff effectiveness, can be assumed to have assisted in raising the achievement level of pupils in ESEA Title I schools.

Objective: To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants.

The rationale for staff development is its beneficial influence on the academic achievement of youngsters. While such influence is not directly measurable, the effects of staff development can be assumed to be a factor in the achievement measured in the instructional components.

Objective: To provide inservice education.

Teachers (N=1160) assigned the highest median ratings (3.5 on a 1-5, Very Little - Very Much, scale) to the extent to which inservice/staff development helped to improve teaching skills in specific instructional areas and to improve skills and use of paraprofessionals such as education aides. Their ratings, shown in Table A, ranged down from these two 3.5 medians to a 2.8 median for inservice help in improving understanding of the effects of poverty on children.

As shown in Table B, teachers with more years of experience usually assigned higher ratings to inservice education, the lowest medians tending to come from ratings by teachers with two or three years of experience in Los Angeles.

Of the 1160 respondents to the Teacher Questionnaire dealing with Parent Involvement, Staff Development, and Intergroup Relations (2076 forms were mailed) 15 offered comments or recommendations concerning inservice/staff development - three of these comments negative.

Among the comments were these:

> Please provide more workshops and inservice meetings which help us develop tangible programs and materials.
>
> The inservice classes are dull. Whenever we approach a controversial subject, it is quickly avoided.
>
> The time spent in making materials to work with could be better used in developing lessons to be taught. Materials . . . could be purchased by the School District. The inservice education classes then could deal directly with individual problems and demonstrations in newer and useful techniques in teaching the various subjects.
>
> I feel that my inservice classes have been very profitable and have benefited greatly from the concern and time my grade level consultant has given me as an individual.

Staff development recommendations which come from some specific components are summarized in the following paragraphs:

Reading specialists expressed the need for more time for preservice, inservice, and planning, including provision of substitute time to allow attendance at conferences, meetings, or demonstrations.

In the mathematics component, teachers commended the introduction of new ideas, techniques, and materials in grade level or inservice education meetings, demonstration lessons, or contacts in the mathematics laboratory.

Counselors suggested topics for inservice and asked for additional time for inservice work with teachers, and to meet with other counselors and pool ideas.

Reactions of aides, teachers, and supervisory personnel indicated a need for more teacher inservice on effective use of aides, and for more inservice for aides in the techniques of giving academic help.

Administrative Reactions

Principals were asked to indicate the amount of time spent and the number of participants involved in district and area inservice, local faculty or grade level meetings, demonstration lessons, classroom observation, and consultation; and to describe any other staff development provisions in their schools.

They were asked further what factors had made for success of staff development activities, what problems had been encountered, or what problems had necessitated changes in staff development plans or activities.

Time estimates proved to be impossible to make or were unclassifiable. The number of participants also was almost impossible to estimate. The following figures, therefore, represent the "educated guesses" of 44 principals:

Activity	Estimated Number of Participants
General faculty meetings at which teaching techniques are considered, or guest speakers on education or the community appear	2251
Smaller meetings by grade level taught, special field of interest, or similar division	2107
Demonstration lessons	1365
Consultation	1126
Classroom observations in own school	963
Visitation and observation at another school	709
Area inservice	422
District-wide inservice	178

Open-end comments by principals credited successes of the program to the use of consultants and resource teachers as leaders (15 responses), staff involvement (10), and staff attitude and cooperation (8). They also mentioned as factors in success of inservice consideration for staff strengths, needs, and interests (9 responses); pay (8); released time (4); and college or university credit (2).

Among problems which the principals saw as necessitating changes in staff development plans or activities were lack of time (9 responses) and lack of supplies, materials, or equipment (6). Late authorization of money for inservice, cuts in the budget, or slowness in paying participants were mentioned by six principals; five mentioned difficulties caused by a large staff or a wide variety of experience in the staff.

Two principals criticized "red tape" and changes in guidelines.

Summary

Success of any program of inservice/staff development is difficult to measure. State objectives used as the basis for categories in teacher evaluation may not adequately represent the goals or scope of inservice/staff development in individual schools or districts.

It is clear, however, that much staff development work is being done and that both teachers and administrators recognize the need for and the importance of this work.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Teachers do not tend to assign high ratings to inservice activity. This may indicate that they are not as involved in the planning and implementation of the program as principals feel they are.

The number of problems listed by administrators may indicate a need for continuing evaluation and revision of programs within each school.

TABLE A

TEACHER RATING OF PROGRAMS IN INSERVICE/STAFF DEVELOPMENT

ITEM	PERCENTAGE						MEDIAN
	Very Little 1	2	3	4	Very Much 5	N	
Extent or degree to which the program of inservice/staff development helped to improve:							
Understanding of the effects of poverty on children	24.7	14.2	32.2	18.8	10.1	902	2.8
Intergroup and intercultural understanding	19.1	16.3	35.5	20.1	9.0	931	2.9
Teaching skills in specific instructional areas	10.1	10.8	27.5	31.7	19.9	1021	3.5
Skills and use of paraprofessionals (e.g., education aides)	11.4	11.0	26.9	27.1	23.6	957	3.5
Skills and use of supportive personnel (e.g., counselors)	13.2	13.0	29.3	27.0	17.5	991	3.3
Skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs	10.8	15.4	29.9	27.3	16.6	1001	3.3
Extent or degree to which the program helped to develop curricular innovations	13.0	13.8	32.3	25.6	15.3	994	3.2

Table A is based on Form 000T-1. Maximum N = 1160

TABLE B

TEACHER RATINGS

Years of teaching in Los Angeles	1	2-3	4-5	6-9	10-14	15-19	20-29	30-40	TOTAL*
Number	244	269	180	171	137	77	44	6	1160
Extent or degree to which this year's program of inservice/staff development, as a whole, helped to improve:					Median Ratings**				
Understanding of the effects of poverty on children	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.7	2.8
Intergroup and intercultural understanding	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.5	2.9
Teaching skills in specific instructional areas	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.5
Skills and use of paraprofessionals (e.g., education aides)	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.5	4.4	3.5
Skills and use of supportive personnel (e.g., counselors)	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.6	3.4	4.0	3.3
Skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.3

Table B is based on Form 000T-1.

*Total includes 32 teachers who did not indicate years of experience.
**On a 1-5 scale, Very Little - Very Much.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: COUNSELING

Abstract

Pupils	7500
Schools	
Public	55
Nonpublic	30
Teachers	32
Approximate Cost	$539,713

Description: The Counseling component provided 28 counselors in addition to the 12 regular District complement of counselors to 55 public schools and five counselors to the 30 nonpublic schools, as well as two counselors to the Follow Through Program, and four to Pre-Kindergarten. Also, one specialist was assigned to coordinate all ESEA Title I counseling activities. Tests and supplies were provided to the 55 public target schools.

Time Intervals: The component operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Pupil counseling interviews averaged 30 minutes in length. Case studies averaged five hours in time of preparation.

Activities: Counselors served in four major areas: (1) completing individual psychological studies of pupils' learning and/or behavior problems, including educational diagnosis, prescriptive teaching suggestions, and recommendations relative to behavior modification; (2) counseling with children and parents, individually or in groups; (3) serving as consultants to teachers and other staff members regarding needs of individual pupils; and (4) working with parents and the community in interpretation of the counseling program, working with other service agencies, and serving on the School Advisory Committee.

Counselors participated in an inservice workshop program which was scheduled and conducted by the District Guidance and Counseling Section, assisted by the ESEA Specialist. Areas covered in the workshops were individual and group counseling techniques, psychological testing, study writing and reporting behavior modification, prescriptive teaching based on behavioral objectives, evaluation of counseling service in terms of "consumer needs," and child development and mental hygiene.

Objective:

- To identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process

Evaluation Strategy: Counselor services were tabulated and classified and were compared with previous services provided. A frequency count was made of pupils served. Ratings and comments by staff personnel were analyzed.

Results: Counselors worked with more than 2000 pupils in individual counseling and more than 1000 in group counseling in 55 public and 30 nonpublic schools. They administered psychological tests to more than 3500 pupils. They counseled with parents of more than 4000 pupils.

Teachers who used the counseling services rated them slightly above average.

Both counselors and administrators made positive comments about the counselors' work, but both believed that the counselors' duties should be better defined. Counselors rated their service opportunities as "less than adequate."

Conclusions: The component attained its stated objective of identifying pupils' specific assets and limitations related to learning.

Administrators felt that the component was effective.

Some confusion appears to exist concerning the nature and priorities of the counselors' specific duties.

Recommendations: Reduce case load through the assignment of more counselors.

Study the role of the counselor to clarify his duties and priorities.

COUNSELING

Detailed Report

This component was evaluated according to central office records of services provided and pupils served, and by ratings and comments of administrators, counselors, and teachers.

Objective: To identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process.

Tables A, B, C, and D report the services of the 40 counselors.

The reasons for and sources of referral of over 5000 public and 400 nonpublic pupils who were referred for counseling are shown in Tables A and B. Three-fifths were boys; most were referred for re-evaluation of need to enter or remain in a program for the Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR); and most of the graded pupils were in the primary grades (public schools).

As seen in Table C, the Binet and WISC tests were used for most of the ability testing. The Wide Range Achievement Test was the principal measure of academic achievement, and the Draw a Person and the Bender were the leaders in semiprojective evaluations of emotional and physiological maturity. Children tested were given an average of two individual tests. Table D shows that most recommendations were made for remedial help without change of program. Of recommendations to programs, most in the public schools were to regular classrooms and EMR. More than six times as many pupils were recommended for EMR placement as for the gifted program.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Five hundred regular teachers returned evaluative ratings of the counseling services. These ratings (Table E) indicate that those who used the services rated them slightly above average in assisting pupils with learning problems, behavior problems, and development of positive attitudes toward school.

Comments written by the teachers indicated that they appreciated the counseling service, both because it helped meet diverse emotional needs of individual pupils and because it provided a welcome solution to many classroom problems.

Some of the weaknesses of the counseling services mentioned by teachers were that it takes too long for pupils to be tested (42 comments); that once the testing results are known for a particular pupil, there is almost no follow-up effort to solve that individual's problem (38); that too much time is spent in testing, and not enough is left for counseling (19).

Several principals expressed pleasure that their school currently had a full-time counselor for the first time and indicated that their schools had greatly needed this service.

Twenty-three of the 28 ESEA counselors returned ratings of their services (Table F). Their responses indicate the feeling that most of their service opportunities were slightly less than adequate.

TABLE A

REASONS FOR REFERRAL OF PUPILS FOR COUNSELING

REASON GIVEN	FREQUENCY PUBLIC	NONPUBLIC
Academically Retarded	935	190
Behavioral Difficulties	320	91
Evaluation for MR Placement	724	3
Need for Further Data	629	115
Psychological Re-evaluation	1735	2
Superior Achievement	566	0
Reason not Stated	109	21
Total	5018	422

Table A is based on Form 27.74.

TABLE B

GRADE DISTRIBUTION OF PUPILS REFERRED

GRADE LEVEL	FREQUENCY PUBLIC	NONPUBLIC
Pre-Kindergarten	35	0
Kindergarten	314	0
Grade One	682	2
Grade Two	569	67
Grade Three	510	95
Grade Four	394	95
Grade Five	343	83
Grade Six	223	78
Ungraded		
Not Enrolled	48	0
Educable Mentally Retarded	1847	0
Opportunity Room	9	0
Other	44	2
Total	5018	422

Table B is based on Form 27.74.

TABLE C

INDIVIDUAL IQ TESTS AND OTHER EVALUATIVE DEVICES USED

ITEM	FREQUENCY PUBLIC	NONPUBLIC
INDIVIDUAL IQ TESTS		
Binet	2287	182
Leiter	366	2
WISC and WPPSI	1606	62
OTHER EVALUATIVE DEVICES		
Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt	1043	145
Draw a Family	356	8
Draw a Person	2488	62
Frostig	5	5
Gilmore Oral Reading	207	168
Gray Oral Reading	36	0
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities	17	0
Prekindergarten Psychomotor	68	0
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	529	31
Rutgers Drawing Test	438	2
Sentence Completion	129	57
Vineland Social Maturity	2	1
Wepman	84	50
Wide Range Achievement Test	3518	145
Other	288	41

Table C is based on Form 27.74.

TABLE D

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS AND PLANS

ITEM	FREQUENCY	
	PUBLIC	NONPUBLIC
PROGRAM		
Educationally Handicapped	33	0
Educable Mentally Retarded	2049	11
Enrichment, ESEA	77	1
English as a Second Language	58	24
Gifted	304	0
Opportunity Room	95	0
Physically Handicapped	2	0
Reading Specialist	326	328
Regular Classroom	2216	38
Remedial Reading	66	7
Trainable Mentally Retarded	48	0
PLANNING FOR		
Acceleration	27	0
Age-Grade Adjustment	25	0
Community Agency	170	14
Enrichment, informal	434	0
Ex-Educable Mentally Retarded	44	0
Limited Attendance	38	0
PTA Guidance Clinic	51	0
Pupil Services and Attendance	106	6
Remedial Help	2574	128
Retention	217	2
School Doctor, other Health Evaluation	489	20
Speech Evaluation	197	5
Tutor	441	5

Table D is based on Form 27.74.

TABLE E

REGULAR TEACHER RATINGS OF COUNSELING SERVICES

ITEM	PERCENTAGE*						MEDIAN**
	Doesn't Apply	Very Ineffective				Very Effective	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
How effective were the counseling services at your school in assisting your pupils with:							
their learning problems	24	10	10	24	20	12	3.3
their behavior problems	21	9	10	26	24	10	3.3
development of positive attitudes toward school	24	10	10	22	23	11	3.3

Table E is based on Form 011T. N = 500

*Based on a 0-5 scale.

**Based on a 1-5 scale.

TABLE F

ESEA COUNSELOR RATINGS

ITEM	FREQUENCY 0 Not Adequate	1 Less than Adequate	2 Adequate	3 More than Adequate	4 Highly Adequate	MEDIAN
Physical facilities in which to work are	2	5	13	2	1	1.8
Supplies and equipment are	0	4	16	3	0	2.0
Time allocated for pupils in federal programs is	0	10	9	3	0	1.5
Opportunity to observe pupils is	4	6	10	1	2	1.7
Opportunity for individual diagnostic work-ups is	1	5	13	2	2	1.9
Opportunity for preventative or developmental counseling is	6	11	3	2	1	1.0
Opportunity for individual counseling with pupils is	2	10	7	1	2	1.4
Opportunity for group counseling is	3	9	7	0	2	1.3
Opportunity for follow-up with pupils is	3	11	6	2	1	1.3
Opportunity for follow-up with clinics and/or agencies is	0	11	8	2	1	1.5
Opportunity to confer with teacher is	0	7	13	3	0	1.8
Opportunity to serve as consultant to teachers is	0	11	9	1	1	1.5
Opportunity to discuss cases with administrator is	0	7	15	1	0	1.8
Opportunity for team members to have case conferences is	2	8	11	1	1	1.5
Opportunity to confer with parents is	1	4	13	3	2	2.0
Time provided for case write-ups is	3	10	7	2	0	1.3
Opportunity to use and evaluate new and/or experimental materials is	7	11	4	1	0	0.9
Opportunity for inservice is	3	6	13	1	0	1.7
Effectiveness of the counseling program is	1	8	11	2	1	1.7

Table F is based on Form 011C. N = 23

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: HEALTH SERVICES

Abstract

Pupils (duplicated count)	92,414
Schools	
Public	55
Nonpublic	30
Staff	
Nurses	35
Other personnel	12
Approximate Cost	$752,113

Description: The Health Services component provided extensive diagnostic services and expedited remediation of health defects. The component served more than 45,000 pupils in 55 public schools and more than 1800 in 30 nonpublic schools. In nonpublic schools, only pupils enrolled in specially funded reading and mathematics projects were served. Twenty-nine specially funded nurses, including one supervisor and two nurses utilized in tuberculosis survey, were assigned to the 55 public schools. One additional nurse also worked with the 10 schools having the Follow Through program. Five more nurses served the 30 nonpublic schools. Prorated services allocated to 55 public and 30 nonpublic schools included physician (seven and three-fourths, plus one supervisor), dentist (two and one-half), and audiometrist (one).

Time Intervals: This component operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Pupil contacts varied in length of time, according to the nature of the services.

Activities: The health services team developed descriptive health profiles for pupils, giving priority to prekindergartners and new pupils. The profiles resulted from individual health appraisals by the professional staff and included visual screening, audiometric testing, dental examinations, and parent consultations. Other services included dental prophylaxis and care to pupils without resources, and tuberculin testing for all pupils new to the District. Nutrition was provided for participants in the Follow Through project. The health services team provided health education for pupils, using multisensory and multilingual teaching aides, and furnished teachers with pupil information with implications for learning. Through its referral service and liaison with other agencies, the staff expedited the correction of defects. ESEA health services personnel participated in a District inservice education program, attending monthly meetings.

Objectives:

- To identify health defects of children
- To assist parents in obtaining appropriate health referral
- To correct dental defects in pupils

Evaluation Strategy: Evaluation consisted of a frequency count of health services and participants. A one-group design was employed throughout, except for a comparison of percentages of health defects corrected. Administrators' comments on component effectiveness were analyzed.

Results: Health services were provided for more than 90% of the 50,000 pupils in the 55 target schools and to project pupils in 30 nonpublic schools. Many pupils received multiple services. Doctors, nurses, dentists, and an audiometrist found more than 22,000 pupil health defects. The team was able to achieve remediation of almost 10,000 defects, 44% of the total. The volume of defects detected was higher than last year, but the percentage of corrections was down slightly. The major defects were dental, ear-nose-throat, and vision. Nurses completed profiles for 9500 pupils.

Administrators commented favorably on the services but stated that nurses needed clerical help.

Conclusions: The component attained its objectives in identifying health defects and achieving the remediation of a satisfactory proportion.

Recommendations: Provide more nurses to extend services.

Provide nurses with clerical assistance.

HEALTH SERVICES

Detailed Report

Evaluation of this component was based on tabulations of services rendered and participants served. Specially devised instruments were used to secure data. The reported services were performed for all pupils in the 55 schools. Since there were approximately an equal number of specially funded personnel and District funded personnel, specially funded services could be considered to be one-half of those reported in the tables.

Objectives: To identify health defects of children.
To assist parents in obtaining appropriate health referral.
To correct dental defects in pupils.

Tables A, B, C, and D show the services rendered by the health services team. The total number of defects corrected, some of which were identified last year, are shown in Table A. Table B, is based on summaries of individual 64-item health profiles, shows the defects identified and corrected of pupils for whom health profiles were developed during the 1969-70 school year. Of pupils examined, 29% had no apparent defects. Most prevalent defects were dental, ear-nose-throat, and vision. As shown in Table B, more than a fifth of the 3600 dental defects were corrected in the same year they were discovered. Some dental prophylaxis was done by school dentists in the ESEA funded dental trailer. Table C shows a partial list of services and findings of school dentists. Tables A and D indicate that nurses and doctors made more than 38,000 medical referrals.

Comparison of services with former years was difficult because of the difference in the number of schools served. Reduction in the number of schools allowed for more services in the 55 target public schools and 30 nonpublic schools, but the ratio of defect corrections was down from last year. Last year's public school sample showed 56% corrections. This year's percentage was 44. Nonpublic percentages of correction for the past four school years were: '66--7, 27; '67--8, 36; '68--9, 43; and '69--0, 34. Health services personnel explained that this was due to (1) increased volume of detections, (2) build-up of defects harder to correct, (3) higher medical costs, and (4) lack of professional and clerical personnel to do follow-up work.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Of 40 principals who returned questionnaires, 35 wrote comments on the health program, all favorable in varying degrees. Respondents praised the health services personnel for their interest in children and the community. Appreciation was expressed for their work in screening for health defects and in providing useful information to teachers. Three principals reported as attributable to the program improvement in learning, attendance, and health habits.

Most negative comments were concerned with program limitations. Principals of large schools considered as inequitable the assignment of one nurse per school. Seven administrators requested more aides to relieve nurses of clerical duties. Delays in printing profile forms and readying the dental trailer occasioned inconvenience and loss of service. Two NPS principals suggested that health services should not be limited to enrollees in special programs.

TABLE A

SUMMARY OF NURSES' SERVICES*

SERVICE	FREQUENCY 55 PUBLIC SCHOOLS	PRE-KGN.	FOLLOW THROUGH	NONPUBLIC	TOTAL
Readmissions	56,664	1,144	295	266	58,369
Exclusions	22,748	600	142	998	24,488
Pupil Conferences	64,232	517	390	3,945	69,084
Parent Conferences	47,190	500	1,367	3,501	52,558
School Personnel Conferences	35,995	1,010	973	1,505	39,483
Case Conferences	5,755	104	103	656	6,618
Health Education (formal)	3,807	158	29	65	4,059
First Aid	85,238	1,455	741	1,768	89,202
Referrals	27,914	641	979	2,744	32,278
Number of Pupils with Defects Reported	17,651	496	242	3,855	22,244
Number of Pupils with Defects Followed-up	24,993	457	483	4,552	30,485
Number of Pupils with Defects Corrected	7,966	190	241	1,328	9,725
Home Visits	7,350	99	219	746	8,414
Pupils Processed Other than Readmissions, Exclusions and First Aid	155,998	1,877	626	32,352	190,853
Classroom Inspections or Observations	20,862	634	347	280	22,123
Vision Screened	36,261	1,160	865	6,493	44,779
Immunizations	25,591	538	0	2,901	29,030

Table A is based on Form 33.182.

*Totals given reflect multiple services, rather than number of pupils served.

TABLE B

SUMMARY OF HEALTH DEFECTS DETECTED AND CORRECTED[1]

DEFECT	PUBLIC SCHOOLS		FOLLOW THROUGH		NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS		TOTAL	
	Detected	Corrected	Detected	Corrected	Detected	Corrected	De-tected	Cor-rected
Eyes	1013	375	39	21	312	170	1364	566
Ear-N-Th	2045	438	73	40	319	37	2437	515
Skin	223	91	15	12	88	5	326	108
CNS	182	34	7	5	194	3	383	42
CVS	192	36	9	7	23	2	224	45
Respiratory	142	68	4	4	23	6	169	78
Abdomen	167	25	21	8	19	4	207	37
GU	127	29	4	1	12	2	143	32
Extremities	518	99	18	11	384	27	920	137
Dental	2758	646	106	43	733	73	3597	762
Total	7367	1841	296	152	2107	329	9770	2322

REASONS DEFECTS WERE NOT CORRECTED	FREQUENCY			
	PUBLIC SCHOOLS	FOLLOW THROUGH	NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS	TOTAL
Parents have not followed through with medical referral	1314	36	424	1774
Child is still undergoing medical treatment toward correcting the defect	1181	46	402	1629
Child was not referred to medical care	1060	6	346	1412
Child was referred and appointment has been made with medical agency	656	37	162	855
Reason not reported	1315	19	444	1778
Total defects not corrected	5526	144	1778	7488
Pupils with no apparent defects	2290	204	257	2751
Maximum N of Pupils	7525	452	1516	9493

Table B is based on Form 011HPS.

[1]Cases processed between September 16, 1969 and May 15, 1970.

TABLE C

SUMMARY OF DENTAL SERVICES AND FINDINGS[1]

ITEM	FREQUENCY
Services	
Pupils examined	23,195
Pupils apparently normal	5,833
Pupils needing prophylaxis	6,293
Pupils with decay	12,771
Pupils with decayed permanent teeth	5,810
Pupils with lost permanent teeth	890
Number of permanent teeth lost	1,328
Pupils with oral pathology	340
Pupils needing advice regarding irregularity of teeth	4,373
Pupils with abscessed teeth	2,433
Pupils needing urgent attention	5,067
Talks and conferences	1,918

Table C is based on Form 33.653.
[1]25 of 55 schools reporting.

TABLE D

SUMMARY OF PHYSICIANS' SERVICES AND FINDINGS

ITEM		FREQUENCY
Services		
Health appraisals		19,797
Special referrals		5,861
Health inspections		2,123
Athletic inspections (incl. ROTC)		9
First aid		1,082
Faculty conferences		2,323
Parent conferences		2,117
Other conferences		753
Home notices		11,252
Faculty lectures		7
PTA lectures		14
Pupil lectures		286
Sanitation inspections		22
	Total	45,646
Conditions Found		
Malnutrition		1,170
Obesity		1,159
Defective vision		1,985
Defective hearing		805
Eye diseases		487
Ear diseases		957
Throat diseases		1,538
Gingivitis		173
Dental caries		6,689
Malocclusion		653
Blood disorder		66
Lymphatic disorder		81
Organic heart		117
Questionable heart		455
Chest diseases		523
Chest deformities		89
Postural defects		1,654
Foot defects		968
Orthopedic, miscellaneous		259
Neurological diseases		283
Emotional disorders		787
Psychosomatic disorders		66
Speech defects		398
CD, reportable		67
CD, nonreportable		121
Skin, communicable		325
Skin, noncommunicable		592
Genitourinary disorders		119
Gonadal defects		121
Gynecological disorders		8
Diabetes		2
Other metabolic disorders		35
Hernia, All Types		434
Congenital defects		105
Miscellaneous		1,645
	Total	24,936

Table D is based on Form 33.6.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: PUPIL SERVICES AND ATTENDANCE (PSA)

Abstract

Pupils (Including parent contacts)	22,700
Schools	55
Counselors	33
Approximate Cost	$498,906

Description: The Pupil Services and Attendance component (formerly Child Welfare and Attendance) provided intensive supportive services supplementing the District program. Thirty-one ESEA-funded pupil services and attendance (PSA) counselors served the 55 target schools. Two additional PSA counselors were provided by the Follow Through program to 10 schools, nine of which were included in the 55 target schools.

Time Intervals: The component operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. On the basis of time budgeted by principals in the individual schools, counselors served for from one to five days per week. Pupil contacts varied in length of time and frequency, according to the nature of the services provided.

Activities: Counselor services included frequent home visitation and contact to identify problems and needs of pupils whose attendance was irregular, or who displayed unsatisfactory behavior or other symptoms of maladjustment; study and follow-up of pupils with serious problems; pupil, parent, and staff conferences to develop recommendations; and liaison with other agencies in the solution of problems and in the promotion of positive attitudes toward school. All PSA counselors participated in a District three-year inservice program. In addition, ESEA Title I counselors attended a summer class in conversational Spanish held from July 7 to August 15, 1969, and continued monthly throughout the school year.

Objectives:

- To increase parent awareness of the responsibility to see that their children attend school
- To improve attendance in school

Evaluation Strategy: Tabulation of services provided and pupils served constituted the major part of evaluation. A sample of pupils' attendance records and school adjustment marks, pre and post, were compared. Utilization of counselor services by schools served as the basis for comparison of the schools' percentages of attendance. Administrators' comments on the effectiveness of PSA services provided were analyzed.

Results: PSA counselors served directly more than 18,000 of the 63,000 pupils enrolled in the 55 target schools.

Sample subgroups referred for attendance and discipline made significant gains in marks on Effort. The discipline subgroup improved in Work Habits but had significantly more absences in the Spring Semester 1970. (A teacher strike occurred during this time.)

No significant relationship was found between counselor time provided on the basis of pupil enrollment and percentage of school attendance.

Staff comments were favorable, but two administrators cited problems in communications.

Conclusions: Because of the teachers strike that lasted 23 school days, attendance data are inconclusive.

Pupils who were counseled intensively over a long period of time improved in adjustment marks.

There is no evidence that the amount of time a PSA counselor is assigned to a school (in the present allotment ratios) affects the gross attendance figures.

Recommendations: Increase the number of counselors.

Provide more clerical assistance.

Provide improved physical facilities--more space, more telephones.

Improve communication between PSA counselors and local schools.

PUPIL SERVICES AND ATTENDANCE

Detailed Report

This component was evaluated on the basis of report card data, central office attendance reports, administrators' comments, and teacher ratings of inservice.

Objectives: To increase parent awareness of the responsibility to see that their children attend school.
To improve attendance in school.

As shown in Table A, PSA counselors closed almost 13,000 cases by the end of the seventh month. Projected to 10 months, closures would exceed 18,000, with the majority of the pupils back in school. Most pupils were referred for absence, with health given as the major contributing factor.

TABLE A

SUMMARY OF PSA COUNSELOR SERVICES IN 55 ESEA SCHOOLS[1]

ITEM		FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
REASON FOR REFERRAL			
Absent		7,610	59
Not Enrolled		639	5
Tardiness		455	4
Attendance Problem		608	5
Behavior		978	8
Special Service		2,500	19
	Total	12,790	100
ATTENDANCE ACCOUNTING			
Truancy		339	4
Legal Absence		5,232	56
Non Illness Absence		3,712	40
	Total	9,283	100
PROBLEMS OF:			
Health		4,153	38
Social Adjustment		1,389	13
School Adjustment		1,474	13
Home Conditions		3,125	29
Undetermined		802	7
	Total	10,943	100
CLOSED CASES			
In School		8,616	67
Legally Exempted		44	1
Out of Jurisdiction		633	5
Unable to Locate		233	2
Continuing Service		829	6
Service Completed		2,435	19
	Total	12,790	100

Table A is based on Form 34-EH-5.

[1]Includes cases processed through seventh school month.

Table B shows the attendance record and adjustment marks of a sample of PSA counselees. Each counselor randomly selected four pupils from those of his counselees who had four or more referrals for attendance before December 1969. Four more, referred for behavior, were selected in the same manner. Also, four two-year counselees (follow-up) with referrals for attendance and/or discipline were selected. All groups made significant gains in Effort. The discipline subgroup made a significant gain in Work Habits but had significantly more absences in the spring of 1970 than before. Absences typically were higher in spring semesters than in the fall. Analysis of marks was difficult because a new marking and reporting policy was initiated in Area East, and a 23-day teachers strike occurred.

TABLE B

MEANS OF PUPIL SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT MARKS AND ATTENDANCE

ITEM AND GROUP	SCHOOL YEAR					
	1967-68		1968-69		1969-70	
	FALL	SPRING	FALL	SPRING	FALL	SPRING
EFFORT (GPA)						
Attendance			2.1	1.9	1.9	2.1*
Discipline			1.7	1.7	1.6	1.9**
Follow-up	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.1*	2.1
			1.9	1.8	1.8	2.0**
WORK HABITS (GPA)						
Attendance			1.9	1.9	1.8	2.0
Discipline			1.7	1.6	1.6	1.8*
Follow-up	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	2.0
			1.8	1.7	1.7	1.9**
CITIZENSHIP (GPA)						
Attendance			2.2	2.1	2.1	2.3
Discipline			1.8	1.7	1.6*	1.8
Follow-up	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.1	2.1*
			2.0	1.9	1.9	2.1**
ABSENCES (DAYS)						
Attendance			20.5	23.1	20.1	24.6
Discipline			11.9	13.9	13.6	17.4*
Follow-up	13.8	17.6	18.4	20.1	17.2	20.4
			17.3	19.2	17.4	21.1
TARDIES (TIMES)						
Attendance			8.2	9.1	9.4	8.1
Discipline			7.4	6.5	8.3	6.4
Follow-up	8.5	10.2	10.9	11.7	10.3	9.2
			8.5	9.1	9.2	8.1

Table B is based on Forms 011PSS-1 and 011PSS-2. Maximum N = 318
*Significant at .05 level. Attendance = 124
**Significant at .01 level. Discipline = 108, Follow-up = 86
Comparisons were made with the preceding corresponding semester; e. g., Spring 1970 with Spring 1969.

Table C shows the school percentages of attendance for 1968-69 and 1969-70. As can be seen from the total means of school percentages, attendance was higher for six of the school months (second through seventh) in 1969-70 than for the same months in 1968-69. Two of the four months in which attendance was lower in 1969-70 were affected by a 23-day teachers strike.

TABLE C

PERCENTAGE OF ATTENDANCE IN 55 ESEA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

SCHOOL MONTH	1968-69	1969-70
First	96.5	96.2
Second	95.7	96.3
Third	92.5	96.0
Fourth	92.7	95.1
Fifth	93.1	94.4
Sixth	93.2	95.2
Seventh	93.8	95.6
Eighth	93.9	77.6*
Ninth	93.3	77.8*
Tenth	93.7	93.2

*23-day teachers strike

A correlation was obtained between assigned counselor time and percentage of attendance. The fifth and tenth months were used since they were relatively free of interruption from strike or holidays. Correlations were -0.20 and -0.19, respectively.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Principals of 33 participating schools praised the program, citing improvement in pupil attendance, attitudes, and achievement resulting from its operation. Eight principals indicated that the program had improved school-home-community relationships.

Problems mentioned by principals included the need for more PSA counselors, more clerical help, and more office space and telephones. Two principals expressed the desire that PSA counselors might be more responsive and responsible to the local school administration.

Of 24 counselors returning questionnaires on the conversational Spanish inservice, 14 had attended. They rated "presentation of lessons" and "appropriateness of lesson content" highest, while "assistance in learning provided by community representatives" was rated lowest.

NPS INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: READING

Abstract

Pupils	960
Schools	30
Staff	
Teachers	31
Supportive Personnel (shared with Mathematics component)	10
Approximate Cost	$390,666

Description: The Reading component in the nonpublic schools (NPS) provided individualized and small-group instruction to children who were deficient in reading and language skills. Linguistic, phonetic, kinesthetic, and basal reading experiences were utilized. The primary reading program included grades two and three, and the intermediate program grades four, five, and six.

Pupil selection was based on available test information and the recommendations of the principal and teachers. The children were grouped according to their age, reading ability, and proficiency in English. Thirty-one reading specialists, as well as four counselors, five nurses, and one doctor (shared with the NPS Mathematics component), were assigned.

Time Intervals: The component operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Class periods ranged from 30 minutes to one hour in length. Working with groups of six to eight, each specialist taught a maximum of 32 pupils daily.

Activities: Activities were planned specifically to develop verbal and conceptual skills. They included listening to stories, viewing films, taking walking trips within the community, participating in library clubs, choral reading, storytelling, creative writing, play acting, writing newspapers, and making puppets and dioramas to share with other classes.

Reading specialists participated in open house activities at the schools, held parent conferences, spoke at faculty and parent club meetings, and served as resource persons to the school staff.

A day of preservice education and 13 inservice education meetings were conducted during the school year to help the participating staff in the attainment of the objective. The inservice program consisted of workshops which stressed teaching methods and techniques, the construction of teaching aides, and administrative problems connected with the program. Guest speakers participated in the areas of health, guidance and counseling, intergroup relations, and reading. Inservice activities included observation visits to public school reading programs.

Objective:

- To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations
  To raise the median gain of project participants in reading by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests

Evaluation Strategy: The Stanford Achievement Test (Grades 2, 3) and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (Grades 4, 5, 6) were given in 30 schools to the ESEA pupils and to a comparison group which consisted of pupils of similar initial reading ability who did not receive ESEA reading assistance. Pre- and posttest reading vocabulary and comprehension scores of the two groups of pupils were compared.

Results: The objective of achieving one year's growth in a school year (0.1 grade level per school month) was exceeded in all grades. In a span of seven months between pre- and posttesting, gains ranged from nine months in the second grade to 16 months in the sixth grade. The ESEA groups showed gains to a significantly greater degree than the comparison groups.

Ratings by parents, classroom teachers, reading specialists, and administrators indicated that the program had improved the academic achievement of pupils.

Teacher participants reported that the inservice program successfully aided in achievement of the objective.

Conclusions: The ESEA groups showed significantly higher gains than the comparison groups. The objective was exceeded in grades two through six.

Parent and staff ratings confirmed effectiveness of the component.

Teachers regarded the inservice program as successful.

Recommendations: The component should be continued, with improved communication between the classroom teachers and the reading specialists.

A more valid way of selecting pupils for the program should be devised.

NPS READING

Detailed Report

Attainment of the component objective was evaluated through scores on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (Reading) and the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II, Reading, Forms W (pre), and Y (post), and by analysis of staff comments and recommendations and responses by parents to a questionnaire.

The Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II, Reading, was administered to ESEA Title I pupils and to a comparison group in grades two and three in October 1969 (pre) and June 1970 (post). In grades four through six, Title I and comparison pupils took the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (Reading) in October 1969 (pre) and May 1970 (post).

The comparison group was composed of pupils who qualified for ESEA reading instruction but could not be enrolled in the program because of a shortage of teachers and/or physical facilities.

Objective: To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations. To raise the median gain of project participants in reading by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests.

The Stanford Achievement Test consisted of two parts: Word Meaning and Paragraph Meaning. The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) also consisted of two parts: Reading Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension.

Analysis of covariance was used.

Means for the ESEA and comparison groups are shown in Table A.

The comparison groups had higher pre mean scores, and the ESEA groups had higher post mean scores at each of the grade levels (primary, middle, and upper). At all grade levels the ESEA groups attained higher adjusted mean scores which were significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The component exceeded its objective of improving classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations (raising the median gain of project participants in reading by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests).

TABLE A

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE BETWEEN ESEA AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II* Word Meaning				
ESEA Groups, Grades 2 and 3	400	7.84	19.24	19.73
Comparison Groups, Grades 2 and 3	102	12.30	18.34	16.43
			F(1,499) = 15.26**	
Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II* Paragraph Meaning				
ESEA Groups, Grades 2 and 3	400	9.96	24.56	25.32
Comparison Groups, Grades 2 and 3	102	15.00	21.60	18.62
			F(1,499) = 48.57**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Reading Vocabulary, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4,5,6	551	11.56	22.85	23.23
Comparison Groups, Grades 4,5,6	181	13.98	17.30	16.15
			F(1,729) = 111.82**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Reading Comprehension, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4,5,6	551	14.16	22.96	23.15
Comparison Groups, Grades 4,5,6	181	15.36	18.69	18.11
			F(1,729) = 69.58**	

*Form W, Pre; Form Y, Post.

**Significant at .01 level.

Grade equivalent gains for ESEA pupils are shown in Table B. All grade gains exceeded the objective of one month's gain for each month of instruction. Greater gains were made by pupils in grades 4, 5, and 6 with the greatest gain, 16 months gain in 7 months' instruction, occurring at the sixth grade level. Although these gains exceeded the objective of a month's gain for a month's instruction, there still remains a decrement in expectancy at each grade level.

TABLE B

READING TEST RESULTS OF ESEA PUPILS BY GRADES

GRADE	N	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE	POST	DIFF.
2	161	1.6	2.5	0.9
3	220	1.8	2.8	1.0
4	230	2.9	4.4	1.5
5	180	3.5	5.0	1.5
6	144	4.1	5.7	1.6

Time interval between pre (October 1969) and post (May 1970) was 7 months.
Grade equivalent is based on median raw score.

A program of inservice education was conducted to aid participants in achievement of the objective.

Teachers evaluated the inservice program on a questionnaire which asked them to indicate on a 1-to-5, low-high scale, their "Expectations" before the beginning of each meeting and their "Fulfillment" as of the close of each meeting.

Expectation and Fulfillment ratings tended to range from 2.7 to 3.9 medians. Three reading-oriented presentations, "Tutors and Tutees to Enhance Reading" (3.4 and 4.0 medians), "Reading Comprehension" (3.3 and 4.0 medians), and "Reading" (3.4 and 4.0 medians), received higher ratings, as did three general topics, "Enriching Learning" (3.3 and 4.1 medians), "Human Relations Workshop" (3.3 and 4.0 medians), and "School-Community Relations Workshop" (3.2 and 4.0 medians). Presentations by the Human Relations Coordinator for the Inglewood Unified School District (3.4 and 4.8 medians) and Dr. William Glasser, Director, Educators' Training Center and Institute for Reality Therapy, (4.5 and 4.8 medians) also received high ratings.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Of 707 parents responding, 96% stated that their children improved in reading, and 99% were in favor of having the program continued. Open-end comments by 186 of these parents supported these high ratings. Parents' responses are summarized in Table C.

TABLE C

PARENT RESPONSES

ITEM	PERCENTAGE YES	NO	N
Do you feel your child improved in reading?	96	4	699
Does your child do more reading at home?	83	17	697
Has your child's attitude toward school improved?	93	7	686
Did you receive information about the program?	83	17	690
Would you like to have this program continued?	99	1	699
Did you visit the program?	50	50	693

Table C is based on Form 021P. Maximum N = 707

Comments by 75% of the 81 regular classroom teachers who responded indicated that they had observed improved academic achievement by their pupils. Ten teachers suggested a need for better communication between themselves and the reading specialist and for a better way of selecting pupils for the program.

Open-end comments by the ESEA reading specialists indicated that small class size, excellent materials, and freedom to innovate were strengths of the program. A weakness, the specialists felt, was that testing materials were not geared to the level of remedial children. They recommended that a different test be used to evaluate reading achievement, although the test results would indicate that such a change is not necessary.

Of the 24 administrators responding, 21 concurred with parents and teachers that the children had made noticeable academic improvement.

NPS INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: MATHEMATICS

Abstract

Pupils	909
Schools	30
Staff	
Teachers	29
Consultant	1
Supportive Personnel (shared with Reading component)	10
Approximate Cost	$361,447

Description: The Mathematics component in the nonpublic schools provided instruction to small groups of children who required help in that area. Activities were planned to improve skill in computation, abstract thinking, and practical application of mathematical knowledge. The primary mathematics program included grades two and three, and the intermediate program grades four, five, and six.

Bases for pupil selection were results of available test scores, recommendations of principal and teachers, and results of informal tests given by mathematics specialists. Twenty-nine mathematics specialists (in two schools the specialist devoted half of her time to reading and half of her time to mathematics) and one consultant, as well as four counselors, five nurses, and one doctor (shared with the NPS Reading component), were assigned.

Time Intervals: The component operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970. Class periods ranged from 30 minutes to one hour in length. Each specialist, working with groups of six to eight, taught a maximum of 32 pupils daily.

Activities: Textbooks and many concrete and manipulative devices were used to help the children crystalize their basic mathematical concepts. Simulated experiences in buying, selling, banking, etc., added practical dimensions to the program.

To assist participants in achievement of the objective, a day of preservice education and 13 inservice education meetings were conducted during the school year, consisting of workshops which stressed teaching methods and techniques, the construction of teaching aides, and consideration of administrative problems connected with the program. Guest speakers discussed health, guidance and counseling, intergroup relations, and mathematics. Inservice participants visited and observed public school mathematics programs. In addition, inservice workshop classes were held every two weeks for three smaller groups.

Objective:

- To improve classroom performance in other skill areas (mathematics) beyond usual expectations
  To raise the median gain of project participants in mathematics by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests

Evaluation Strategy: The Cooperative Primary Tests, Mathematics (Grades 2, 3), and Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Arithmetic (Grades 4, 5, 6), were given in 30 schools to the ESEA pupils and to a comparison group which consisted of pupils of similar initial mathematical ability who did not receive mathematics assistance in the ESEA component. Pre- and posttest arithmetic scores of the second- and third-grade ESEA pupils and pre- and posttest scores in computation, concepts, and application of the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade ESEA pupils were compared with scores of their non-ESEA counterparts in the comparison groups.

Questionnaires and rating scales were completed by parents and staff at midyear.

Results: The objective of achieving one month's growth in mathematics for each month of instruction was more than doubled in grades 4, 5, and 6. In seven months of instruction, gains in those grades were 16 and 17 months.

Adjusted mean scores of the ESEA groups at grade levels two through six were higher than the adjusted mean scores of the comparison groups. In every case gains were made which were statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the ESEA group.

Both the general inservice and the workshops were endorsed by the mathematics specialists.

Regular classroom teachers, mathematics specialists, and administrators reported increased pupil interest and academic achievement.

Reporting that their children had improved in arithmetic, parents endorsed component activities and were in favor of having the program continued.

Conclusions: The objective was exceeded in grades two through six. The ESEA groups showed significantly higher gains than the comparison groups.

Parent and staff ratings confirmed the effectiveness of the component.

The mathematics specialists regarded the inservice program and the workshops as successful.

Recommendations: The component should be continued. Provision should be made for parent workshops. Specific guidelines should be established for pupil selection.

NPS MATHEMATICS

Detailed Report

Attainment of the component objective was evaluated according to scores on the Cooperative Primary Tests (Mathematics) and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (Arithmetic) and by analysis of staff comments and recommendations and responses by parents to a questionnaire.

The Cooperative Primary Tests (Mathematics, Form 23A) was administered to ESEA Title I pupils and to a comparison group in grades two and three in October 1969 (pre) and May 1970 (post). In grades four through six the ESEA Title I and comparison pupils took the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (Arithmetic) in October 1969 (pre) and May 1970 (post). Comparison groups were composed of pupils who qualified for ESEA mathematics instruction but could not be enrolled in the program because of a shortage of teachers and/or physical facilities.

Objective: To improve classroom performance in other skill areas (mathematics) beyond usual expectations.
To raise the median gain of project participants in mathematics by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests.

The Cooperative Primary Tests consisted of Part 1 (where the teacher read the stimulus material), and Part 2 (where the pupil worked on his own with printed stimulus material). Scores on the two parts were combined into one total score. The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) consisted of three parts: Arithmetic Computation, Arithmetic Concepts, and Arithmetic Applications.

Means for ESEA and comparison groups are shown in Table A. The comparison groups had higher pre mean scores, and the ESEA groups had higher post mean scores at each of the grade levels (2 through 6). Analysis of covariance revealed that the ESEA groups also had higher adjusted mean scores, with differences in gains statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

TABLE A

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE BETWEEN ESEA AND COMPARISON GROUPS

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Cooperative Primary Tests Mathematics, Form 23A				
ESEA Groups, Grades 2 and 3	214	23.49	38.66	38.68
Comparison Groups, Grades 2 and 3	51	23.71	29.80	29.71
			F(1,262) = 54.21**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Computation, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4,5,6	646	21.37	32.94	33.16
Comparison Groups, Grades 4,5,6	198	22.93	29.13	28.41
			F(1,841) = 81.19**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Concepts, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4,5,6	646	10.87	18.07	18.19
Comparison Groups, Grades 4,5,6	198	11.57	13.94	13.54
			F(1,841) = 177.87**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Applications, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4,5,6	646	5.74	9.57	9.70
Comparison Groups, Grades 4,5,6	198	6.64	7.65	7.21
			F(1,841) = 72.47**	

**Significant at .01 level.

3

Grade equivalent gains for ESEA pupils are shown in Table B. A measure of success in achievement of the objective of one month's gain for each month of instruction is available for grades four through six. In those grades the gains exceeded the objective by more than double, gains of 16 and 17 months being achieved in seven months. Although these gains far exceeded the objective, there still remains a decrement at each grade level.

TABLE B

MATHEMATICS TEST RESULTS OF ESEA PUPILS BY GRADES

GRADE	N	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE	POST	DIFF.
2	56		61%ile	
3	158	18%ile	43%ile	
4	220	2.9	4.5	1.6
5	219	3.4	5.1	1.7
6	197	4.4	6.0	1.6

Time interval between pre (October 1969) and post (May 1970) was 7 months. Grade equivalent and percentile equivalent are based on median raw score.

A program of inservice education was conducted to aid participants in achievement of the objective. Teachers evaluated the inservice program on a questionnaire which asked them to rate their "Expectations" before the beginning of each meeting and their "Fulfillment" as of the close of each meeting.

"Expectation" and "Fulfillment" ratings tended to range from 2.7 to 3.9 medians on a 1-to-5 low-high scale. Four mathematically oriented presentations, "Q-Rods" (3.9 and 4.6 medians), "Math, Rand Corporation" (4.5 and 4.4 medians), "Mathematics" (4.5 and 4.9 medians), and a lecture by Dr. George Moore, associate professor of engineering at USC (3.3 and 4.6 medians), received higher ratings. Five general topics, reported in the NPS Reading evaluation, also received high ratings.

In addition to attending general inservice, the mathematics specialists divided into three groups and met for workshops one hour every two weeks.

A questionnaire designed to evaluate these workshops asked teachers to rate, on a 4-point scale, how much the workshops had increased their knowledge of a wide range of mathematical concepts and principles and techniques. Ratings by two of the groups ranged from 2.8 to 4.0, with highest ratings going to recognizing shapes, ratio and proportion, Cuisenaire rods, plotting points, linear graphing (slope), and linear graphing (intercept). Ratings by the third group were lower, ranging from 1.3 to 3.8, with highest ratings going to attribute blocks and plotting points.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Of 632 parents responding to a questionnaire, 95% stated that their children improved in arithmetic, and 99% were in favor of having the program continued. Their responses are summarized in Table C.

TABLE C

PARENT RESPONSES

ITEM	PERCENTAGE YES	NO	N
Do you feel your child improved in arithmetic?	95	5	614
Does your child do more arithmetic at home?	76	24	607
Has your child's attitude toward school improved?	94	6	599
Did you receive information about the program?	76	24	614
Would you like to have this program continued?	99	1	617
Did you visit the program?	37	63	617

Table C is based on Form 022P. Maximum N = 632

In open-end comments, 59 of 82 (72%) regular classroom teachers responding to the questionnaire reported that they had observed increased pupil interest and academic achievement. Six teachers mentioned that the use of manipulative aids was very helpful in instructing children.

The 21 mathematics specialists who responded cited as major strengths of the program freedom of the teacher to develop programs with individual children (13), small class size (11), inservice meetings conducted by capable leaders (3), and supplies and equipment (3).

Weaknesses of the component mentioned by the specialists were late arrival of materials (5), slowness of communication between supervisors and school (3), and lack of an adequate method of evaluating progress of the children (3).

The following recommendations were made by the specialists: expedite return of test results (This was accomplished by reporting to them at year end the growth their pupils had made.), set up parent workshops, provide definite written guidelines for pupil selection (grade level, number per class, high and low percentile, I.Q. limitations), and devise or obtain another test that can be used with ESEA remedial children. (Test results, of course, showed that these children did well on the test used.)

Administrators (21 of the 24 responding) stated in their open-end comments that the specialists were interested in the children and were making every effort to help them. Eight of the principals mentioned fine rapport between staff and the mathematics specialists.

NPS SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: PARENT INVOLVEMENT, STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Abstract

Participants		
Parent Involvement		4145
Staff Development	Approx.	100
Intergroup Relations		2257
Schools		30
Approximate Cost	(Included in NPS Language Arts)	

Description: Programs in Parent Involvement, Staff Development, and Intergroup Relations were a part of ESEA Title I supportive services activities for nonpublic schools in 1969-70.

Programs in the participating schools, grades one through six, involved regular staff members and specially funded personnel and were designed to improve academic achievement of Title I youngsters in these schools.

Time Intervals: Activities were conducted from September 1969 through the end of the school year in June 1970.

Activities: Accompanied by parent volunteers when possible, NPS pupils took field trips, not only for the educational value of these school journeys but also to become acquainted with children from other sections of the city whose culture and environment were different from their own. Additional plans for interschool enrichment-type activities had to be dropped when ESEA funds were curtailed; however, ethnic studies and consideration of minority contributions to society were incorporated in the remedial program, when possible, throughout the year.

Advisory committees of parents and parent-teacher groups met regularly and scheduled programs for their meetings that included demonstrations of teaching techniques, workshop sessions, and presentations by outside speakers. Parent volunteers assisted teachers in the classroom, and the schools encouraged after-school father-son, mother-daughter, and family activities.

Staff development programs for ESEA personnel in the NPS program included pre-school workshops and inservice education meetings on nonpublic school holidays. Teaching aids were constructed, and workshops also dealt with teaching methods and techniques, understanding of the culture of poverty, and administrative problems connected with the program. Guest speakers from the areas of curriculum, health, and guidance and counseling took part.

Inservice education programs for the specially funded teachers were open for regular faculty of the nonpublic schools who also received special invitations to certain sessions. This was done so that continuity of programs, understanding, and a team relationship might be established for the benefit of pupils.

Objectives:

- To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants
- To improve communications among school, home, and community resources
- To assist parents in understanding the educational program of the school
- To provide inservice education
- To change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience

Evaluation Strategy: Academic achievement of Title I participants, as reported in the evaluation of instructional components, was measured by the administration of standardized tests.

A questionnaire to be completed by administrators was designed to obtain a description and evaluation of activities in parental involvement, staff development, and intergroup relations in their schools.

Results: Parental involvement, staff development, and intergroup relations were found to be part of ESEA supportive services in the nonpublic schools. Effects of these activities on academic achievement of youngsters could not be measured directly.

Work in parental involvement and staff development appeared to be more extensive than were programs involving intergroup relations.

Conclusions: Effects of the supportive services on academic achievement of youngsters were measured, but only indirectly, by standardized tests of achievement.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between general Diocese programs in the supportive services areas and ESEA programs or activities.

Recommendations: If intergroup experiences are recognized as having value for youngsters, interschool enrichment-type activities should be planned for the coming year and included in the 1970-71 budget.

If ESEA services are designed to benefit only ESEA youngsters, steps should be taken to develop and evaluate unique activities in parental involvement, staff development, and intergroup relations. Such activities should be distinguishable and separated from general Diocese programs or activities.

NPS PARENT INVOLVEMENT, STAFF DEVELOPMENT, INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Detailed Report

Administrators of 22 nonpublic schools replied to a questionnaire designed to evaluate activities in the supportive services fields of parent involvement, staff development, and intergroup relations. Reactions of participants in inservice education programs also were obtained. These responses are reported in the evaluation of specific instructional components.

Objective: To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants.

It is assumed that involving parents in the school program, increasing the competence of the staff, and providing intergroup experiences all affect pupils' academic achievement. However, these assumed effects can neither be measured directly nor attributed with any certainty to one of the three supportive services activities rather than to another.

Standardized tests were used to measure levels of academic achievement reached by participants in the Reading and Mathematics components.

Objectives: To improve communications among school, home, and community resources.
To assist parents in understanding the educational program of the school.

Twenty-two NPS principals indicated on an Administrative Evaluation of Supportive Services questionnaire at midyear that Parent-Teacher Associations or parent groups were active in all but one of their schools. The administrators listed a total of 4145 members in the 21 schools that had PTA's, with individual school memberships ranging from 70 to 364 (197.4 average), and from 22% to 103% of enrollment (Membership of teachers and of both parents of a child can account for membership greater than enrollment). The total membership of 4145 represented 60% of the schools' enrollment.

More than two-thirds of the parent groups had scheduled nine or ten meetings for the year, with an average attendance of 95 (range, 27 to 250) at meetings from September through January.

Principals' responses indicating the number of parents active as PTA officers and/or committee members can be summarized as follows:

Number of Schools Reporting	Number of Parents Active as PTA Officers and/or Committee Members	TOTAL
1	0	0
2	4	8
1	5	5
1	6	6
2	8	16
5	10	50
1	11	11
2	12	24
2	15	30
1	24	24
3	25	75
1	30	30
22		279

Three schools reported the employment of one parent each, while the remaining schools said that they had no parents as paid employees. At 19 schools, however, parents served as volunteer aides. Two schools reported having one such volunteer; and, at the other extreme, one had 40 volunteers. Altogether, 18 principals reported 188 volunteers, who gave an estimated 405 hours of service to the schools per week; and one other principal, who did not estimate hours of time given, said that almost all the mothers volunteered at least some service during the year.

Conferences, Classes, Programs

Twenty of 21 principals said that their schools made provision for parent conferences, including minimum day scheduling to permit early dismissal of pupils, the setting up of after-school and evening schedules, and provision of substitute time or class coverage.

Two schools offered workshops in math for parents, and two had classes in reading. These four programs reached an estimated total of 145 parents. Four principals had established classes for Spanish-speaking parents, and two reported the offering of classes (with average attendance of 20 and 25) in which parents might study children's motivations and behavior. One school had a class for preparation of teacher aides (enrollment, 13). Parent classes studying the primary program, Black history, and child care each were mentioned by one principal.

School programs involving parents included Christmas or other seasonal or religious program (9 mentions), home visitation (8), Open House (7), Men's Club (4), Parents' Club (3), art festival or exhibit (3), and (two mentions each) sports activities, academic competition-speech tournaments, award presentations, and a school bazaar. One mention each went to block parents, room mothers, a science fair, a talent show, a music/dance festival, a fashion show, school drives, talks by parents at a job opportunity awareness program, and provision of a liaison teacher.

Only one administrator felt that the amount of parent participation had declined from the 1967-68 school year; 11 said that it had remained about the same, and 10 that it had increased.

Objective: To provide inservice education.

NPS administrators reported the number of instructors involved in staff development activities, as follows:

Activity	Number Involved
General faculty meetings at which teaching techniques are considered, or guest speakers on education or the community appear	106
Smaller meetings by grade level taught, special field of interest, or similar division	75
Area inservice	51
Consultation	37
Classroom observation in own school	27
Visitation and observation at another school	10
District inservice	10

Reactions of ESEA Title I-funded teachers to inservice education sessions in reading and mathematics are shown in evaluations of these instructional components.

Principals attributed success of staff development activities to division into grade levels or sections, the setting up of goals and evaluation of accomplishment, faculty sense of responsibility, faculty interest in students and special learning problems, and teachers' awareness of the school's willingness to provide inservice education programs for them. One administrator mentioned encouragement for teachers to attend activities sponsored by colleges and professional groups through provision for substitutes.

Objective: To change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience.

Finances for formal PIE-type exchange programs were eliminated in budget cuts, but administrators reported the following activities to build better understanding and improve attitudes toward other groups.

Activity	Number of Schools Reporting
School journey tours	5
Provisions of ethnic studies center(s) in classroom or library	3
Development of curriculum materials dealing with contributions of minority groups	3
Recruitment and employment of minority group people from the community	2
Sister-school program	2
School newspaper exchange or speaker's bureau	1
Other exchange of pupils and/or teachers with schools of different ethnic compositions	1
Assembly speakers or programs promoting intercultural understanding	1
Sensitivity training for staff members	1
Other approaches to improve intergroup relations:	
Special school celebrations	1
Attending meetings and showing interest	1

The six principals who recorded the above activities estimated that 2257 participants were involved.

Many principals did not complete the section of the questionnaire that dealt with intergroup relations. This may be interpreted as a further indication of less activity in this area, at least at midyear, than in parent involvement and staff development.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Nonpublic schools are increasing their awareness of the importance of parent involvement and of the values of staff development and intergroup experiences. Efforts are increasing in these fields.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between general Diocese programs in parent involvement, staff development, and intergroup relations and activities in these three supportive services areas specifically developed through ESEA funds and limited to ESEA Title I pupils, their teachers, or their parents.

READING AND MATHEMATICS CORE

Abstract

Pupils (Grades 7-9)	3055
Schools	15
Reading teachers	31
Mathematics teachers	31
Education aides III	62
Counselors	15
Counselor interns	6
Clerks	27
Compensatory education coordinators	15
Dates	9/69-6/70
Cost budgeted	$2,898,816

Description: The Reading and Mathematics Core consisted of two components designed to improve the pupils' achievement in these areas.

The reading/language development component provided intensive instruction for the improvement of skills in reading, listening, speaking, and writing.

The mathematics component presented fundamentals of mathematics, provided for understanding of certain mathematical ideas, and developed reading skills for the understanding of mathematics as it is needed in everyday living and in the pursuit of advanced education.

Pupils assigned to the Reading and Mathematics Core were able underachievers: that is, pupils of average or above-average ability who had been achieving two or more years below their grade level. Class size was limited to 20. Negro pupils accounted for 64% of the ESEA enrollment, Mexican American 34%, and other ethnic groups 2%.

Participating junior high schools each had a compensatory education coordinator, in charge of the school components, and a counselor, who also taught one period of reading. Each class had a teacher, specializing in the component subject, and the services of an education aide. In addition, there were intermediate clerks and clerk typists in the SAC offices serving ESEA personnel.

Time Intervals: The reading and mathematics classes were conducted daily from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970, except for the two-week Christmas holidays, the one-week spring vacation, and the four and one-half week period of the teachers strike late in the school year. Consequently, instead of the eight months of instruction expected between pre- and posttesting, there actually were six. Proportionately, this reduces the objective of 10 months' achievement in eight months to eight months' achievement in six months. The pupils took one class daily in reading and language development, and one class in mathematics.

Activities: Pupils enrolled in the Reading and Mathematics Core received individual tutoring facilitated by a full-time teacher aide working with the regular teacher in each class. All teachers and aides were trained to use prescriptive teaching, the major instructional technique in the Core, which involves diagnosing or studying the needs of each pupil and then prescribing or preparing and applying instruction to meet those individual needs.

Experimental commercial study kits, skills books, and independent readers, as well as teacher-made materials, were used to individualize instruction.

Workshops were conducted for all aides, teachers, and counselors in the program, and for the compensatory education coordinators, to assist them in attainment of the objective.

Counseling, psychological, and health services, intergroup relations activities, and parental involvement supported the achievement component.

Objective:

- To raise the median achievement level of project participants in reading and mathematics by 10 grade-norm months in 8 months, as measured by standardized achievement tests

Evaluation Strategy: Standardized achievement tests (CTBS) in reading, language, and arithmetic were administered in October (pre) and in May (post) to all ESEA classes and to selected non-ESEA classes. Comparison pupils were enrolled in regular District English and mathematics classes.

Nonstandardized achievement and attitude tests were administered to selected ESEA and comparison groups. In addition, questionnaires were completed at year-end by staff members, pupils, parents, and inservice participants.

Results: On standardized tests (CTBS) ESEA pupils made significantly greater gains (at the .01 level) than did comparison groups in reading comprehension and arithmetic computation, while comparison groups made significantly greater gain (.05) in arithmetic application. There was no significant difference on the other five subtests.

On the nonstandardized achievement tests, no significant differences between ESEA groups and comparison groups were found. A positive correlation was evident between IQ and test scores.

The component's stated performance objective, refigured on actual instructional time, as previously explained, called for eight months' achievement in six months. The percentage of pupils who gained eight or more months on the CTBS ranged from a low of 27% of the seventh graders (in vocabulary) to a high of 48% of ninth graders (in arithmetic computation).

Prescriptive teaching was significantly successful in reading vocabulary and in arithmetic computation and concepts, while nonprescriptive showed significant gains in language mechanics and expression. Only 9 (20%) of the 46

reading teachers and 9 (29%) of the 31 mathematics teachers were judged by central office specialists to have implemented the full range of prescriptive teaching techniques.

Administrators, staff, pupils, and parents generally approved of the program. Parents stated that SAC teaching was good but also felt strongly that more of their suggested solutions to local school problems should be accepted. Pupil comments strongly favored the SAC program but were divided in their feelings about teachers.

Conclusions: Instructional objectives were partially met, as measured by standardized tests.

According to survey data, inservice objectives were met.

Prescriptive teaching was significantly successful in three of the eight areas tested; nonprescriptive teaching was significantly successful in two.

Staff, pupils, and parents supported the program.

Recommendations: Teachers and other staff personnel should continue to develop prescriptive techniques so that all SAC teachers will use this type of teaching. The techniques of successful prescriptive teachers should be studied for wider application.

Central office staff should follow up pupils' critical comments about teachers.

Attention should be given to improving school-community relations, with more information about SAC sent home and more parent participation invited.

The use of teacher-made nonstandardized tests should be expanded so that more frequent process evaluation and feedback would be possible.

READING AND MATHEMATICS CORE

Detailed Report

Data from two interrelated activities, reading/language instruction and mathematics instruction, which form the Core package, are combined in this report. Attainment of the component objective was evaluated according to the following indicator variables: pupil scores on standardized reading, language, and arithmetic tests; pupil scores on nonstandardized reading and arithmetic tests; and pupil, staff, and parent ratings of the components.

The pupils assigned to the Reading and Mathematics Core were selected as able underachievers; that is, pupils of average or above average ability who had been achieving two or more years below their grade level. Class size was limited to 20. Comparison pupils were enrolled in regular District English and mathematics classes.

The reading, language, and arithmetic sections of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) were given at the beginning and end of the school year to all ESEA classes and to selected non-ESEA classes. ESEA pupils took two reading-oriented classes--reading and language, plus arithmetic. The language component provided intensive instruction for the improvement of skills in reading, listening, speaking, and writing. The mathematics component presented fundamentals of mathematics, provided for understanding of certain mathematical ideas, and developed reading skills necessary for the understanding of mathematics as it is utilized in everyday living and in the pursuit of advanced education.

Teacher-designed nonstandardized reading and arithmetic tests were administered to selected ESEA and comparison classes.

All ESEA pupils were interviewed during the school year by ESEA counselors. Records were maintained of all such counseling, as well as of health services given the pupils (reported under the Auxiliary Services component).

Pupil ratings of program effectiveness were obtained at year-end from selected pupils in each ESEA school.

Questionnaires rating the program were completed by selected staff personnel, pupils, and parents at year-end.

Objective: To raise the median achievement level of project participants in reading and mathematics by 10 grade-norm months in 8 months, as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Form Q3 of the CTBS was administered in October 1969, and Form R3 in May 1970, to all ESEA reading classes and to selected comparison English classes.

An analysis of covariance (Table A) showed that ESEA pupils made significantly greater gains on two of the eight CTBS subtests, reading comprehension and arithmetic computation, at the .01 level; while the comparison pupils made significantly greater gain in one, arithmetic applications, at the .05 level.

ESEA Negro pupils, when compared to non-ESEA Negro pupils (Table B), made significantly greater gain in one CTBS subtest, reading comprehension, at the .01 level. There was no significant difference in the other subtests.

ESEA Mexican American pupils, when compared to non-ESEA Mexican American pupils (Table C), made significantly greater gains in three CTBS subtests; reading comprehension and arithmetic computation, at the .01 level, and arithmetic concepts at the .05 level. There was no significant difference in the other subtests.

Mexican American groups made substantially greater gains than the Negro groups. Both ESEA ethnic groups advanced more than their ethnic comparison groups.

Over the eight CTBS subtests, the ESEA grade equivalent gains were greater than those of the comparison groups on six tests, the same on one, and less on one. In reading and language, ESEA pupils made three months' gain, to two for comparison pupils. In arithmetic, ESEA gained an average of five months, to four for comparison.

Between the pre- and posttests instruction was interrupted by two weeks of Christmas holidays, one week of spring vacation, and four and one-half weeks of a teachers strike in the latter part of the school year. With the added loss of time occasioned by the teachers strike, less than six months of instructional time remained, which, with the attendant unrest, affected both staff and pupils to an unmeasurable extent and probably diminished <u>effective</u> instructional time to considerably less than six months.

The component's stated performance objective was to achieve ten months' achievement in eight months' of instruction. Since actual instructional time turned out to be about six months, the ten and eight months can be reduced proportionately to eight and six, respectively. Table D, designed to this proportion, shows the percentage of pupils who gained eight or more months in the six months' testing time. On individual subtests of the CTBS, pupils who attained eight or more months of gain ranged from a low of 27% of the seventh graders, in vocabulary, to a high of 48% of ninth graders, in arithmetic computation. Mean percentages of all eight subtests showed 32% for seventh graders, 37% for eighth, and 36% for ninth.

An analysis of pupils' post grade placement (Table E) showed that some pupils reached their grade level and, therefore, might qualify to return to regular classes in 1970-71. In language mechanics 13% of seventh graders, 16% of eighth, and 14% of ninth graders attained their grade level norm. There were lesser gains in each of the other CTBS subtests.

Pupils enrolled in the SAC Reading and Mathematics Core received individual tutoring based on a diagnosis made by SAC teachers of their needs. The tutoring was facilitated by the presence of a full-time teacher aide, in addition to the regular teacher in each class.

Inservice education provided all SAC teachers with help in prescriptive teaching, involving diagnosing or studying the needs of each pupil and then prescribing, preparing, and applying instruction to meet individual needs.

Although all SAC teachers were exposed to prescriptive teaching, and some used a portion of the methods taught, only 9 of 46 SAC reading teachers and 9 of 31

arithmetic teachers were identified by central office specialists as using prescriptive teaching techniques. An analysis of ESEA classes using prescriptive teaching, as compared with ESEA classes using nonpresciptive (regular SAC) teaching, is summarized in Table F. The results showed that, on the eight CTBS subtests, there was no significant difference in pre-post gain in reading comprehension, language spelling, and arithmetic applications; nonprescriptive teaching was significantly better (at the .05 level) in language mechanics and expression; and prescriptive teaching was significantly better in reading vocabulary (at the .01 level) and in arithmetic computation and arithmetic concepts (at the .05 level).

Prescriptive teaching was most successful in reading and arithmetic, while nonprescriptive showed greater gains in language.

Teacher-designed seventh-grade tests in arithmetic and reading were administered to ESEA seventh-grade pupils. The reading test (Reading Review I) was given in February 1970. In April the arithmetic test (Arithmetic Review I) was given. Comparison testing was accomplished with AB938 seventh graders in similar programs in June 1970. These results, none statistically significant, are shown in Table G.

The ESEA seventh-grade pupils were, by selection criteria, able underachievers (mean IQ of 92.5), while the comparison AB938 pupils included all of the seventh-grade pupils in their project school (mean IQ of 94.8).

Strengths and Weaknesses

Although all ESEA teachers received inservice instruction in prescriptive teaching, the majority did not utilize it. ESEA teachers need more intensive inservice in prescriptive teaching and more motivation to use it.

Data indicated that the AB938 pupils of comparable IQ achieved more in all areas, except for arithmetic, in the range below 70 IQ, and for reading, in the range between 71 and 80. It should be noted, however, that the AB938 comparison pupils had approximately three months' more instruction in reading than the ESEA pupils (excluding teacher-strike time), and two months' more instruction in arithmetic. No significant differences were found from t tests applied. In general a positive correlation was evident between IQ and test score.

Reliability was calculated for both teacher-made instruments: $r = .80$ for reading and .35 for arithmetic (by Kuder-Richardson formula 20).

It might be noted that the SFP Measurement and Evaluation Branch provided SAC school and central office staff with computer printouts of pre and post CTBS results, arranged by individual pupil and by class, to be used as additional input for the process of prescriptive teaching.

Eighty-nine (40%) of 225 staff members responded to the Staff Questionnaire. Of these, 36% were classroom teachers, 20% were administrators, 17% were counselors, and the remaining 27% were reading and mathematics specialists, teacher aides, or clerical personnel.

Personnel from the various groups responded to evaluation of the several workshops offered during the year in the following percentages: workshops in reading and

mathematics were evaluated by 36% of those responding, writing behavioral objectives by 26%, intergroup relations by 18%, and PACT Coordinators by 13%. Aides, clerical, and instructional media workshops accounted for the remaining 25%.

Median responses ranging from 1.6 to 2.1 were all positive (all below 3.0 on a 1 to 5, positive-to-negative scale, except in cases where the item was so stated as to reverse the direction), with an average median response of 1.6. (See Table H.) The staff felt most affirmatively about the greater ease in the improvement in counseling skills (4.8) (See footnotes [a] and [b], Table H.), and in writing behavioral objectives (1.7). They felt weakest in understanding of intergroup relations (2.1), and in improvement of attitudes toward the effects of poverty on children (2.0).

Staff reaction to items relating to improvement of instructional skills averaged 1.8 on the scale described above.

The overall comments regarding workshops in staff instruction were parallel to the overall rating of all workshops: generally approving, but not strongly favorable. One-third of the respondents felt that this workshop was "a waste of time," "not well prepared," "confusing"; that it "lacked leadership," and "did not help." The balance of the responses was neutral or mildly approving: "beneficial," "gained better understanding," "very useful," "fine at first--then repetitious and boring."

Administrators judged the workshop for coordinators to be good, and all comments were favorable.

Clerks felt their workshops did not apply to them and that the equipment demonstrated was not appropriate.

Forms for pupil evaluation of SAC were distributed to two randomly selected SAC classes in each school. Of the 600 forms sent out, 550 (91%) were returned. Each pupil received an envelope with his questionnaire, and upon completion of the evaluation he placed the form in the envelope and sealed it. As a result of this protection of privacy nearly 50% of the pupils returning questionnaires wrote comments which in quantity and quality were superior to such responses in previous years.

Pupils were asked to rate questions from Strongly Agree (1) to Strongly Disagree (5) (Table I). They gave highest rankings to their ability to get along with (1.8) and reading (1.9) and lowest rankings to their ability to get along with other kinds of kids (2.6) and to medical care (2.4). All ratings, however, were positive.

Pupil comments concentrated mainly on the help received from the SAC program (45% of the responses). They indicated that through the program they had learned more (than in regular classes), had received more attention, and had enjoyed the experience. Many indicated a desire to remain in the program and wrote that the SAC should be enlarged to include more students.

Of the 270 pupils who wrote comments 15% said something about their teachers. Their comments clustered in one extreme or the other: "excellent," or "mean and grouchy." On the positive side they wrote, typically, "I like the way the teacher listens and lets you say what you want to" and "they talk with you and

help you understand more." Representative negative remarks included "teachers are impatient," "do not explain sufficiently," and "give unnecessary work." Other suggestions included a desire for more field trips, more audiovisual help, and divided feelings regarding the helpfulness of the teacher aides.

Parent questionnaires were sent to 265 parents: 175 through the schools to parents of SAC pupils and 90 directly to parents active in school-community groups. Only 87 forms (33%) were returned. Of these, 65 were from parents of junior high pupils, 3 were teacher-parents, 10 were teacher-aide-parents, and 9 were community-aide-parents. Of all of these, 28 were members of a District Citizens' Compensatory Education Advisory Committee, and 49 were active in a local Parent Advisory group. Thus, it appeared that only 10 of the 175 parent forms distributed by the schools were returned.

Parents were asked to rate questions from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). (See Table J.) Parents felt strongly that "schools should accept more parent's solutions for school problems" and "that the SAC teaching is good." They disagreed with the statement that "the community is eager to attend committee meetings." Responses to all but this one statement were favorable.

Parents generally wrote comments of approval such as "have helped my children to learn a lot," "program is an asset," and "doing a wonderful job." Others noted "not enough information sent," "need more inservice for parents," and "no follow-thru in senior high school." Regarding community-school activities, they wrote: "have people from Urban Affairs meet our committee," "wish more parents would attend the meetings," "more home visits," and "I never receive information about meetings."

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: PARENT INVOLVEMENT, AUXILIARY SERVICES, STAFF DEVELOPMENT, AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Abstract

Schools (Grades 7-9)	15
Dates	9/69-6/70
Parent Involvement	
Parents	266
Cost budgeted	$103,368
Auxiliary Services	
Pupils	3055
Counselors	15
Counseling Interns	6
Consulting Counselors	3
Nurses	2
Cost budgeted	$385,310
Staff Development	
Staff	152
Parents	133
Cost budgeted	$27,114
Intergroup Relations	
Pupils	5400
Staff	168
Parents	6
Cost budgeted	$19,698

Description: The PARENT INVOLVEMENT component was designed to stimulate communication between SAC parents and the school through cooperative effort by the compensatory education coordinator, District-funded home-school coordinator, and target school community aides, with guidance by the principal. Parents met in groups in their own school communities or with an organization at the District level to discuss children's educational needs.

In the AUXILIARY SERVICES component, counselors, interns, and consulting counselors were assigned to specific schools to provide guidance and counseling to project pupils. These personnel also consulted with school staff members and parents.

Registered nurses helped identify project pupils' health and dental defects and secured necessary appointments for treatment.

The STAFF DEVELOPMENT component conducted seminars in which SAC personnel participated, with leadership by District personnel and experts in the social sciences. These seminars were intended to provide SAC personnel with greater skill in helping disadvantaged children increase their academic abilities. More understanding was sought in the variables that impinge on these children and in the use of all available resources and human understanding to promote their academic development.

The INTERGROUP RELATIONS component concerned itself with attitude improvement and problem solving approaches in human relations. It involved ESEA staff, pupils, and parents. Activities were planned and organized at local schools by school staffs and the District's Office of Urban Affairs, and experiences were scheduled for both students and adults.

Time Intervals: The four components operated from mid-September 1969 to mid-June 1970, interrupted in the spring by a four and one-half week teachers strike.

Parents met monthly, or more often, as necessary.

Counselors saw many counselees on a continuing basis. In three schools counselees were programmed to receive intensive group and/or individual counseling weekly.

SAC pupils were helped with their health and medical problems throughout the school year. Most inservice workshops were held after school and on Saturdays and lasted for from two to eight hours.

Intergroup relations staff and pupils met during and after school hours and on weekends.

Activities: Parents and school staffs met in discussion groups and worked together to plan and implement school activities. They also received instruction in reading and mathematics, and learned about the SAC program and how to manipulate its materials and supplies.

Pupils were involved in individual and group conferences with counselors and health personnel and were given follow-up appointments with doctors, dentists, and referral agencies. In addition, counselors consulted with school staffs, administered tests, kept a record of counseling activities, reviewed student records, and adjusted pupil programs. Nurses also consulted with school staffs, kept a record of contacts, and arranged pupil appointments.

Consulting counselors made weekly visits to project schools to help SAC personnel understand pupils' educational strengths and weaknesses. A prescribed instructional plan was cooperatively planned for individual project pupils.

SAC pupils with defects detected by nurses, doctors, and dentists were scheduled for appointments and continued to be seen throughout the year as long as treatment was needed.

Workshops were held to help SAC personnel best utilize individual, school, and community resources to help develop project youngsters' academic and personal potentials. Workshops also were designed to increase communication and understanding between the school and community.

Workshop activities consisted of lectures, open-discussions, panels, role-playing, sociodrama, and audio-visual presentations.

Pupil multicultural activities included week-end camps, "Young Soul" stage productions, and college campus conferences on Saturdays. Adult staff members

and community representatives met for various periods of time ranging from single three-hour sessions in local schools to two six-hour sessions on consecutive Saturdays.

Objectives:

- To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA participants
- To improve communications among school, home, and community
- To identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process
- To identify health defects of children
- To correct dental defects in pupils
- To assist parents in obtaining appropriate health referral
- To improve understanding of the effects of poverty on children
- To improve intergroup and intercultural understanding
- To improve teaching skills in specific instructional areas
- To improve skills and use of paraprofessionals
- To improve skills and use of supportive personnel
- To improve skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs
- To improve skills of participants in counseling with disadvantaged students
- To change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience

Evaluation Strategy: All project pupils were compared with non-ESEA groups from their own and other schools. Variables examined were pre-post scores on standardized and nonstandardized achievement tests (see report on secondary Reading and Mathematics), and pre-post responses on an attitude scale.

Counselors kept a monthly record of counseling contacts with parents. Parent involvement activities were rated by parents at year-end, and open-end comments were obtained.

SAC counselors, interns, and consulting counselors kept monthly records of contacts with pupils. At year-end pupils, parents, counselors, and administrators also were asked to rate and comment on the quality of supportive services.

At year-end participants in staff development workshops were asked to rate the worth of each workshop and to make constructive critiques. Staff members completed questionnaires regarding how intergroup workshops may have influenced their attitudes toward other ethnic groups and also rated the workshop

effectiveness. A semantic differential attitude test, Intergroup Measure of Concepts (IMOC), was designed to measure pupil changes in attitude. Following their experience in the component, all participants were asked to judge its effectiveness.

Results: Parent responses on a questionnaire rated the parent involvement program as effectively meeting its goals. Ratings on program features were generally positive, except for the degree of community enthusiasm to attend committee meetings.

Open-end comments by parents affirmed that program objectives were met, although negative opinions were expressed concerning poor parent attendance at meetings and lack of parent and community involvement in component activities.

Pupils were involved by counselors in 6547 intensive individual and 1098 group counseling sessions. More than 4000 guidance activities and over 28,000 conferences with school staff and parents were initiated by counselors.

Nurses held more than 5000 conferences with project pupils, parents, and school personnel. In addition, their efforts helped to correct defects of project pupils in 352 cases.

Scores on a locally devised attitude scale (QMOC) indicated significant growth by the ESEA group, while the comparison group showed negative results.

Pupils, on a questionnaire evaluating SAC, rated positively questions about the academic offerings of the program and the counseling, but were somewhat undecided about health and dental services. Pupil comments were heavily positive in mentioning the benefits of the SAC program and overwhelmingly endorsed its continuance.

Ratings of supportive services by counselors and administrators tended to be neutral, except in detection of health defects (which were negative), and in counselor assistance to teachers (which were positive). Comments by these same personnel substantiated their ratings, except that the SAC nurse and community aides were judged to be of great value.

Eighty-nine staff members responded to the questionnaire rating staff development. Median ratings on all items were positive, on a 1-5 (positive-negative) scale. The staff felt most affirmatively about the greater ease in writing behavioral objectives (median 1.5) and about improvement in counseling skills (1.2). They felt weakest in their understanding of intergroup relations (3.9) and in improvement of attitudes toward the effects of poverty on children (4.0).

Staff reactions to items relating to improvement of instructional skills were all positive.

Staff comments were varied but most indicated a need for a greater number of better-planned, more meaningful workshops.

While parent ratings of multicultural aspects were positive, pupil ratings indicated some ambivalence. Comments from both these sources, however, commended the component offerings.

There were some noteworthy shifts in the means of the pre-post scores of pupil groups on a local attitude scale (IMOC), in which shifts tended to be slightly more positive than negative. The Negro group displayed significant changes in attitudes toward Myself and Afro-Americans (positive) and Most People (negative).

When responses of Negro and Mexican American groups were combined, they indicated a significant positive change of attitude toward other ethnic and racial groups.

Conclusion: The number of participating parents fell below expectations. Parent participants strongly urged continuation of the Parent Involvement component, although some expressed negative attitudes toward certain aspects of the program.

Project pupils showed only slight gains in achievement. Data on the QMOC attitude scale indicated positive growth by the ESEA group.

Counselors and nurses held numerous conferences with pupils, parents, and staff. Ratings by pupils and staff of supportive services were mainly neutral; but their comments were overwhelmingly positive, with certain limitations expressed. Staff development ratings were positive, comments were varied, and participants recommended that the program be continued with modifications.

Comments from participants in the intergroup relations program were strongly positive. In the same program ratings by parents were positive but those by pupils were somewhat negative. A need for continuing the programs was indicated, with certain changes recommended.

Recommendations: The parent involvement program should be launched earlier in the school year, and all available media of communication should be utilized to promote it.

The auxiliary services component should be continued. Group counseling should be initiated in certain schools where it has not been used so that more project pupils may be helped.

Firmer and continuous leadership and assistance from the central office should be maintained.

More thorough screening procedures should be provided for the detection of health defects.

Background and training of workshop participants should be considered carefully in forming homogeneous inservice groups.

Workshop leaders should strive to provide firm directions and relevance in their workshop presentations.

Workshops should be started early in the school year or before school opens.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT, AUXILIARY SERVICES, STAFF DEVELOPMENT, AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Detailed Report

The degree of attainment of component objectives was evaluated according to the following indicator variables: pupil scores on standardized achievement tests and teacher-made tests; pupil responses to attitude scales; counselor and nurses' records of pupil, parent, and staff contacts; and pupil, parent, and staff ratings of components.

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) was given pre and post to all project pupils and to selected comparison groups at each project school. District-constructed tests of reading and mathematics were administered periodically throughout the school year.

All project pupils were interviewed by project counselors at least twice during the school year. Randomly selected pupils were counseled weekly in groups and individually in three schools. Project nurses attempted to see all project pupils at least once during the school year. Records of all contacts were kept by project personnel and were collected at year-end.

Pupils' ratings of component offerings were obtained from 40 randomly selected pupils at each project school.

Also, a randomly selected sample of parents was asked to respond to a questionnaire on program effectiveness.

The counselors gave project pupils an attitude scale, pre and post, to determine the pupils' perception of self and environment.

Evaluation forms to measure project effectiveness were distributed to project staff at year-end.

Objective: To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA participants.

Data and narrative of attainment of this objective are contained in the report on Instruction: Reading and Mathematics Core.

Objective: To improve communications among school, home, and community.

The parent involvement component sought this objective. The compensatory education coordinator, District-funded home-school coordinator, and target school community aide cooperatively coordinated their efforts to stimulate further communication between SAC parents and the school. All activities were supervised by the principal.

At the local level, from 6 to 10 SAC parents (depending on the size of the SAC program) met in advisory council committees, and all parents met in principals' advisory groups and PTA's. These groups concerned themselves with local problems of their project schools, such as planning and organizing fund-raising drives,

supervising off-campus trips, aiding the teacher in routine tasks, providing guidance to pupils, and learning about SAC and how to use its materials and supplies appropriately.

Several parents also were members of a district-wide organization called Citizens' Compensatory Education Advisory Committee, which focused its attention on general ESEA Title I problems.

To gauge the impact of activities, a questionnaire was sent to 265 parents (Table J). A 1 high--5 low scale was used to show agreement (1) or disagreement (5) with each of several statements. Of the 89 parents who returned questionnaires (58%) 52 agreed (median 1.8) that the information they received from school regarding the SAC program was adequate. Most of these same parents, however, were not certain that the community wished to attend committee meetings (median 3.4).

The following statements are typical:

> I do hope the SAC program continues.
>
> I feel the SAC program is an asset to the school and child.
>
> I just wish more parents would attend the meetings.
>
> Must find a way to interest parents to attend some meetings.

Thirty-one staff personnel, coordinators, and counselors indicated with a median rating of 1.9 that "SAC parents were easier to work with than non-SAC parents." Their added comments neither substantiated nor disproved this declaration.

Twenty-one counselors and two nurses kept records of their contacts with parents (Tables L and M). Counselors indicated that they saw 1009 parents in face-to-face situations and 1010 in home conferences; however, they recorded 2127, more than twice as many contacts, by phone. Nurses' records, which did not differentiate telephone contacts, showed 899 parent conferences at school and 226 at home. Each counselor had an average of 197 parent contacts during the school year, as compared to a nurse's average of 563. The face-to-face conferences for each counselor averaged 96 a year and phone contacts 101 for the same time span. It seems that the nurses' parental contacts outnumbered counselors' nearly 3 to 1, not considering such factors as time scheduled or intensity and quality of contacts.

Objective: To identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process.

A counselor in each of the 15 target junior high schools provided guidance and counseling to pupils participating in the reading/language development and mathematics core program. Each of six schools also was assigned an intern counselor, who performed supervised guidance and counseling services. Three consulting counselors from the central office were allocated five project schools each in which to consult with SAC staff and pupils.

Project counselors diagnosed pupil learning problems through individual and group counseling sessions. They also consulted with school staffs, administered

tests, maintained and reviewed pupil records, programmed pupils, and made referrals. Counselor records (Table L) showed 6045 individual contacts and 1052 group meetings, as well as 2401 sessions for pupil appraisal. Records also indicated over 28,000 conferences with school personnel and parents, more than 4000 guidance activities; nearly 3400 intake interviews; more than 4100 conferences with parents, all conducted in an effort to help project youngsters feel better about themselves and their environment and achieve academically at a higher level.

An attitude scale, The Quick Measure of Concepts (QMOC), was administered pre and post to selected project pupils. A shift of mean was interpreted as noteworthy if the post mean moved one point minus or plus from the pre mean, based on the standard error for present and previous QMOC data.

Half the post means for the Negro comparison group were statistically significant in a negative direction (Table O). Negro ESEA pupils showed one significant negative change and two significant positive changes. Negative significant changes by both Negro groups were directed to other persons in one's environment and in the school.

The Mexican American ESEA group (Table P) showed six positive and one negative attitude changes that were statistically significant. The Mexican American comparison group made one positive change (sig. at .05) and one negative (noteworthy). The groups concurred in positive attitudes toward counselors.

The combined results on QMOC of all ESEA and comparison groups (Table Q) indicated that the ESEA groups were significantly positive in four concepts, while the comparison groups were significantly negative on four. Both combined groups backtracked significantly on the concept "My School."

It appears that the ESEA groups advanced more positively in their attitudes and self-concepts than did the comparison groups, and that, as a consequence, there is evidence that for the ESEA groups a limitation relating to the learning process has been reduced.

Objectives: To identify health defects of children.
To correct dental defects in pupils.
To assist parents in obtaining appropriate health referral.

The nurses, working with doctors and dentists, helped identify pupils' health and dental defects and arranged for necessary appointments for treatment. Nurses also interviewed pupils, consulted with school staffs, and maintained records of contacts.

Nurses' records (Table M) showed 2209 pupil conferences. There were 2123 follow-up contacts of pupils with defects, of whom 352 pupils had defects corrected. In addition, nurses indicated that they had 899 conferences with parents, attempting mainly to assist in securing appointments for the children.

Table N shows a summary of pupils for whom health profiles were completed. Because summaries were not worked up for all pupils, the data from this table do not approximate the data of Table M; however, they do give a breakdown of the kinds of defects discovered. Of those cases reported in Table N, 354 pupil defects were detected, and 161 (45%) were corrected. Of those detected, 222 (63%) were eye or dental problems. More dental defects were detected than eye

defects, although a greater percentage of the latter were corrected (66% to 43%). Also, 73 pupils were reported as still receiving treatment; consequently, the total ratio of corrections ultimately would be somewhat higher than the total corrected. Counselors also held an unspecified number of conferences in an effort to obtain medical and dental appointments.

Pupils (Table I) were neutral in their ratings of help received from the SAC nurse, while parents (Table J) were undecided on the difficulty of getting medical or dental care for their children. Staff (Table K) agreed that many health defects persisted undetected in pupils. Commentaries by these three groups tended to be supportive of health services.

Objectives: To improve understanding of the effects of poverty on children.
To improve intergroup and intercultural understanding.
To improve teaching skills in specific instructional areas.
To improve skills and use of paraprofessionals.
To improve skills and use of supportive personnel.
To improve skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs.
To improve skills of participants in counseling with disadvantaged students.

SAC personnel participated in seminars led by District personnel and experts in the fields of psychology, education, sociology, and human relations. These seminars, included in the Staff Development component, were intended to provide SAC personnel with skills in understanding and helping disadvantaged children increase their academic output, in understanding the environment of the disadvantaged, in utilizing most effectively their skills as paraprofessionals and supportive personnel, in providing counseling relevant to disadvantaged children, and in improving human relations. Workshop activities consisted of lectures, open discussions, panels, role-playing, sociodrama, and audio-visual presentations. Seventy-five staff members and 14 parents participated in these discussion sessions.

Questionnaires designed to determine the effectiveness of these sessions were mailed to 225 participants. The 89 (40%) that were returned were from 32 teachers, 17 administrators, 15 counselors, 11 central office specialists, 9 teacher aides and assistants, and 5 community representatives. Of these personnel, 36% evaluated workshops in reading and mathematics, 26% in Writing Behavioral Objectives, 18% in Intergroup Relations, 13% in Compensatory Education Coordinators, and 25% in other topics. All workshop objectives were evaluated positively on a high-low, 1-5, scale (Strongly Agree--Strongly Disagree). Respondents judged that their counseling skills had improved most, followed closely by improvement in their instructional and organizational skills. Although they rated workshops positively, participants showed concern toward the presentations, the use of special equipment, and attitudes toward the effects of poverty on children.

Objective: To change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience.

The Intergroup Relations component, in cooperation with the District's Office of Urban Affairs, concerned itself with attitude improvement and problem-solving approaches in human relations. The project involved ESEA staff personnel, pupils, parents, and other community members. Activities for pupils, planned

in cooperation with the Urban Affairs staff were organized at the local schools. These included week-end camps, "Young Soul" stage productions, and college conferences. Pupil and staff experiences were scheduled either separately or simultaneously, as appropriate. Approximately 3000 pupils in 15 schools participated. Also involved were 255 staff members and five community representatives, who met in three 6-hour sessions on Saturdays.

A locally developed semantic differential instrument to measure changes in self-concept was completed by Negro and Mexican American pupils before and after a week-end camping experience. The results are shown in Table R. The instrument is composed of 12 concepts and 16 different adjective pairs, 10 of which apply to any one concept. The pupils rated each concept or idea pre and post on each of its adjectival scales.

Negro participants displayed five positive and five negative noteworthy shifts, of which three positives were statistically significant. (A "noteworthy" shift was defined as a mean score change of plus/minus one or more, the approximate value of the standard error of measure.) The Mexican American group exhibited seven positive and two negative changes in attitude, none of which was statistically significant. Combined, both groups showed five positive and three negative noteworthy shifts, of which one negative change was statistically significant. The two groups, both separately and combined, uniformly regarded "My Education" and "Anglos" negatively and "Mexican American," "Afro-Americans," "My Freedom," "Myself," and "My Future" positively.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Project personnel, parents, and pupils were asked to respond through questionnaire ratings and comments on the effectiveness of components. All ratings used a high-low, 1-5, scale (Strongly Agree--Strongly Disagree).

Thirty-one staff members rated (Table K) the most effective feature of these components as counselors' aiding SAC teachers to work effectively with pupils, with a median of 1.2 and the least effective as detecting health defects (item 3, median 1.7).

Staff comments did not support their ratings but highlighted instead the need for more consulting help from the central office counselors, smaller classes, more humanistic teachers, a positive regard for the community aides and SAC nurse, and a need for starting a consistent inservice earlier in the year.

Ratings by 71 parents showed (Table J) most agreement on the item "The schools should accept more parents' solutions for school problems" (item 6, median 1.6), and least agreement on item 16, "The community is eager to attend committee meetings" (median 3.4). Parents' comments overwhelmingly endorsed the SAC program but indicated the need for more parents at meetings. This concern for improved attendance at meetings was reflected in these typical comments:

> More community participation needed.
>
> Try to get more parents and community involved.

Of the 600 SAC pupils, 550 responded to a questionnaire about SAC components. Their ratings (Table I) noted beneficial outcomes relating to achievement and

counseling and reflected no positive or negative reactions toward other program features. Comments substantiated the benefits of the instructional phase of SAC; about half the SAC pupils indicated the program was helpful to them.

Pupil comments included the following:

> I like the SAC program because you learn more, you get more attention and I just think it's better. (N=120)
>
> I think I am doing better in the SAC program than regular classes because the teachers listen to you more. (N=44)

Workshop participants included project staff members and parents who provided ratings (Table H) and comments on attainment of workshop objectives; methods of presenting workshop materials; and implementation of skills, understandings, and attitudes gained from workshop interaction. All median ratings of participants were positive. Counseling competency was rated highest, followed closely by writing behavioral objectives. Workshop comments did not correlate positively with workshop ratings; negative statements clearly outnumbered positive. The following were included:

> Persons who conduct workshops should be better prepared and know what they are attempting to do. (Eleven such comments)
>
> Like so many other of these workshops I felt it was a shameful waste of money. (Three such comments)
>
> In general, the workshops were a waste of time. (Three such comments)
>
> Workshops fine at first--then repetitious and boring. (Two such comments)

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL (NPS) INSTRUCTION AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Abstract

Middle schools	2
Pupils (Grades 7-8)	175
Staff	
Reading teachers	2
Mathematics teachers	2
Science teachers	2
Counselors	2
Nurse	1
Dates	9/69-6/70
Cost budgeted	$119,963

Description: As an extension of the public school ESEA project, programs of intensive instruction in reading, arithmetic, and science, with support from counseling and health services, were established at two archdiocesan "middle" schools (grades seven and eight) which serve large numbers of low-achieving pupils from economically depressed areas. School enrollment consisted primarily of Negro and Mexican American pupils. Class size was limited to 20. Each nonpublic school (NPS) was assigned one teaching position for reading, one for arithmetic, and one for science.

The Parental Involvement component sought to increase communication among project youngsters, parents, and school personnel.

The project placed one full-time counselor in each school to provide guidance and counseling to the pupils and to be available to the staff for educational and psychological consultation.

A registered nurse was assigned to both schools at mid-year to help identify health and dental defects and to arrange treatment for project pupils.

NPS consulting counselors participated with public school ESEA counselors in staff development seminars led by District personnel and outside experts.

The Intergroup Relations component, in cooperation with the District's Office of Urban Affairs and local NPS staff, conjointly planned experiences designed to improve attitudes and human relations among project pupils, staff persons, parents, and other community members.

Time Intervals: Generally, pupils attended one 50-minute class period daily for each of the three subjects.

Parent groups met irregularly, whenever necessary.

Counselors saw pupils on a need or continuing basis; staff members were seen

when they requested it. Health services also were provided on a need basis. Some project pupils were seen at regular intervals for treatment.

Most workshops were held after school and on Saturdays. Counselors attended Friday workshops, usually for four hours.

Activities: The instructional program provided diagnosis of the pupils' reading and arithmetic deficiencies, allowing a sequential development of essential reading skills and the development of fundamental arithmetic concepts related to the individual school's current curriculum. Science was taught by the inductive method.

Parents and school staffs met in discussion groups to plan and implement school activities, such as off-campus trips, to upgrade both the ESEA and the regular programs.

Project pupils talked with counselors and the nurse and kept appointments with the doctor, dentists, and referral agencies. Counselors held interviews, consulted with school staffs, administered tests, kept records of contacts, studied pupil profiles, programmed pupils, and made appropriate referrals.

The project nurse held interviews with pupils and staffs, kept records of contacts, reviewed pupil records, arranged pupil appointments, and made referrals. She also helped the doctor and dentists screen project pupils to determine defects and necessary treatments. Some pupils were treated on a continuing basis.

Workshops were conducted to help project personnel utilize all available resources to stimulate learning in project pupils and to increase communication and understanding between the school and community. Lectures, discussions, panels, role-playing sessions, sociodrama enactments, and audio presentations were among the techniques used by workshop leaders.

Objectives:

- To raise the median achievement level of project participants in reading, arithmetic, and science by 10 grade-norm months within 8 months, as measured by standardized achievement tests
- To raise the academic achievement level of ESEA participants
- To improve communications among school, home, and community
- To identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process
- To identify health defects of children
- To correct dental defects in pupils
- To assist parents in obtaining appropriate health referral
- To improve understanding of the effects of poverty on children
- To improve intergroup and intercultural understanding

- To improve teaching skills in specific instructional areas
- To improve skills and use of paraprofessionals
- To improve skills and use of supportive personnel
- To improve skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs
- To improve skills of participants in counseling with disadvantaged students
- To change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience

Evaluation Strategy: Standardized achievement tests in reading, arithmetic (Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills--CTBS), and science (Metropolitan Achievement Test--MAT) were administered pre (October 1969) and post (May 1970) to all of the ESEA pupils and to selected non-ESEA comparison classes. Analysis of covariance was applied to the results to determine the significance of any score changes.

Treatment variables included the facts that ESEA pupils had one period daily each of reading, arithmetic, and science, while comparison pupils were enrolled in regular seventh- and eighth-grade classes in archdiocesan elementary schools (K-8). One comparison school had mostly Negro enrollments, while the other was of mixed ethnic population. The mean IQ for ESEA pupils was 85.6; for comparison pupils, 100.3.

Counselors kept a monthly record of counseling contacts with parents. Project pupils were compared with non-ESEA pupils on a scale that measured changes in attitude.

Staff members completed questionnaires rating the effectiveness of staff workshops.

All component participants were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the component in which they were involved. All questionnaire ratings and comments were tabulated, analyzed, and reported.

Results: There were no significant differences between the pre-post achievement scores of ESEA pupils and comparison groups.

The average gain for all ESEA pupils on the six subtests of reading, arithmetic, and science was five months during the seven months of instruction between pre- and posttesting. However, 32% of the pupils averaged gains of ten months or more over all six subtests.

Parents who returned the questionnaire rated the parent involvement goals as effectively met. They rated program features as generally positive, except for a lack of community enthusiasm to attend committee meetings.

Parent comments affirmed that program objectives were met, although there were concerns expressed about poor parent attendance at meetings and an absence of parent and community involvement in component activities.

Counselors involved pupils in 502 intensive individual and 46 group counseling sessions. They also initiated more than 80 guidance activities and more than 700 conferences with school staff members and parents.

The project nurse held more than 100 conferences with project pupils, parents, and school personnel. In addition, her efforts helped to correct defects of project pupils in 73 cases (42%).

Scores on a locally devised attitude scale (QMOC) indicated a strong negative trend from pre to post for both the ESEA and comparison groups against concepts related to self, grades, school, and teachers.

Ratings of supportive services by counselors and administrators tended to be neutral, except in the areas of health defects detection (negative) and counselor assistance to teachers (positive). Comments by these same personnel substantiated their ratings. The nurse, however, was considered highly valuable.

On a staff development questionnaire, personnel were most affirmative about their greater ease in writing behavioral objectives and their improvement in counseling skills. They felt that they were weakest in understanding of intergroup relations, in improvement of attitudes toward the effects of poverty on children, and in using special equipment.

Staff reactions to items relating to improvement of instructional skills were all positive.

Staff comments were varied, but most indicated a need for a greater number of better-planned, more relevant workshops.

Parent ratings of multicultural aspects were positive, and comments from this group commended component offerings.

Conclusions: Instructional objectives were partially met, as measured by standardized tests. Five months' gain was achieved in seven months of instruction for the total group, and at least ten months' gain was achieved for 32% of the pupils.

Fewer parents participated than had been expected. Parent participants, however, strongly urged continuation of the Parent Involvement component.

Data on the QMOC attitude scale revealed lowered scores in attitudes toward self and school by both ESEA and comparison groups.

Counselors and nurses held numerous conferences with pupils, parents, and staff members. Although ratings by pupils and staff of supportive services were mainly neutral, comments by these two groups were overwhelmingly positive, with certain limitations. Staff development ratings were positive, but comments were varied; participants recommended continuation of this program, with modifications.

Recommendations: The ESEA curriculum should be maintained in both project schools.

The parent involvement program should be launched earlier in the school year and promoted with all available media of communication.

The Auxiliary Services component should be continued. Group counseling should be initiated with increased frequency in both schools so that more project pupils may be helped.

Firmer and continuous leadership and assistance from the central office should be maintained. More thorough screening procedures for detection of health defects should be provided.

Background and training of workshop participants should be considered carefully to form groups with similar interests or needs.

Workshop leaders should strive to provide firm direction and relevance in their workshop presentations.

Workshops should be started early in the school year, before school opens.

Project pupils should be exposed to intergroup (multicultural) activities. Earlier planning should resolve calendar conflicts.

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL (NPS) INSTRUCTION AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Detailed Report

Attainment of component objectives was evaluated according to the following indicator variables: pupil scores on standardized achievement tests; pupil responses to attitude scales; counselor and nurse records of pupil, parent, and staff contacts; and ratings by parents and staff members.

The reading and arithmetic sections of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) were given to all ESEA and selected non-ESEA classes at the beginning and end of the school year. Similarly, pupils were tested for science with the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT). The results of all pretesting were provided in the fall semester as feedback to both central office and school operational personnel. Similarly, pre-post results were provided at year-end.

ESEA pupils took each of the three subjects for one period daily. The reading program provided diagnosis of reading problems and a sequential development of essential skills. The arithmetic program emphasized the development of fundamental concepts relating to the current curriculum. The science program, taught by the inductive method, gave laboratory experiences and guidance in making concrete application of information.

The 175 pupils assigned to the instructional program were selected as able underachievers; that is, pupils of average or above-average ability who had been achieving at two or more years below their grade level. Class size was limited to 20.

The ESEA schools selected were two newly created archdiocesan "middle" schools having seventh and eighth grades only. One school had a predominantly Mexican American population, while the other was predominantly Negro.

Comparison pupils were enrolled in two archdiocesan regular elementary schools (K-8), of which only seventh- and eighth-grade pupils were tested. One of the comparison schools had largely Negro enrollment, while the other was of mixed ethnic population.

The counselors interviewed all project pupils at least twice during the school year and counseled them weekly, in groups and individually, in both schools. The nurses attempted to see all project youngsters at least once during the school year. Project personnel kept monthly records of all contacts.

Parents, selected randomly, responded to a questionnaire rating program effectiveness.

Project pupils completed an attitude scale, pre in October and post in May, to determine their perception of self and environment.

Evaluation forms were distributed to project staff members at year-end to determine project effectiveness.

Objective: To raise the median achievement level of project participants in reading, arithmetic, and science by 10 grade-norm months within 8 months, as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Form Q3 of the CTBS was administered in October 1969 and Form R3 in May 1970 to all ESEA reading pupils and to selected comparison classes. Form Am of the MAT also was given, pre and post, to ESEA and comparison classes.

An analysis of covariance (Table S) showed that the comparison pupils made significantly greater gain in reading vocabulary than did the ESEA pupils. There were no significant differences in results on the other tests.

On the five CTBS subtests the ESEA grade equivalent gains were greater than those of the comparison groups in two tests and less in three. In reading ESEA pupils made an average gain of about four months, the same as comparison pupils. In arithmetic ESEA pupils averaged five months' gain to seven months' for comparison. In science ESEA pupils made seven months' gain to six for comparison pupils.

The percentage of ESEA pupils who attained or surpassed the performance objective of 10 months' achievement in 8 ranged from 18% to 48% (Table T) over both grades and all subtests, for an average of 32%. Not more than 7% of all pupils tested had reached their grade level in achievement by the end of the year.

Objective: To improve communications among school, home, and community.

In the Parental Involvement component parents and school staffs met in discussion groups and worked together in planning and implementing school activities, such as off-campus trips. Consulting counselors coordinated communication-stimulating activities. Locally, project parents met in Parent Advisory groups and all parents met in PTA groups to focus attention on local concerns and to gain information and actively support the ESEA and regular programs.

Of the 89 parents who responded to a questionnaire (Table J), 52 agreed that the information they received from school regarding the ESEA program was adequate. The median for all responses on this item was 1.8 (on a 1-5, high-low, scale). Most of these same parents, however, were not certain that the community wished to attend committee meetings (median 3.4). The following statements typified the disparity of parental feelings:

> I do hope the SAC program continues.
>
> I feel the SAC program is an asset to the school and child.
>
> I just wish more parents would attend the meetings.
>
> . . . must find a way to interest parents to attend some meetings.

Thirty-one staff members (Table K) indicated in their ratings of parent interaction (median 1.9 on the 1-5, high-low scale) that the relationships were positive. Comments neither substantiated nor disproved the judgments expressed in the ratings.

Records were kept by the two counselors (Table L) and one nurse (Table M) to show, among others, the contacts they had with parents. The two counselors indicated that they talked with 47 parents in face-to-face situations (23 each) and 37 in phone conferences (18 each). The nurse's records, which did not differentiate contacts which were made by telephone, showed 120 parent conferences at school and 40 more at home. Each counselor talked to an average of 42 parents during the school year, as compared to the nurse, who saw 160. The nurse saw four times as many parents as did counselors, although such factors as time scheduled for seeing parents and intensity and quality of contacts should be considered.

Objective: To identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process.

Consulting counselors conducted interviews, consulted with school staffs, administered tests, maintained records of contacts, studied student profiles, programmed pupils, and made appropriate referrals.

Project counselors utilized individual and group counseling for diagnosis of pupil learning problems. Counselor records (Table L) showed that in their efforts to help approximately 200 project pupils feel better about themselves and their environment and, consequently, improve their academic achievement, counselors had made 502 individual and 46 group contacts, as well as conducted 111 sessions for pupil appraisal during the year. They also had conducted numerous conferences with school personnel and parents, had led more than 80 guidance activities, had participated in 29 intake interviews, and had consulted 635 times with school staffs and more than 80 times with parents.

An attitude scale, the Quick Measure of Concepts (QMOC), was administered pre and post to selected project pupils and two comparison groups. A shift was interpreted as noteworthy if the post mean score moved one point, minus or plus, from the pre mean, based on the standard error for previous and present QMOC data.

In 2 out of 10 concepts, post means for the Mexican American ESEA group showed noteworthy shifts on My Classmates and Most People (Table U), with the latter concept's score reaching statistical significance (negative). The Mexican American comparison group data contained one significant negative change (Teachers), as well as four noteworthy changes (positive: My Grades, My Future; negative: Counselors, My School). All significant negative changes were directed toward other persons in the environment by both the ESEA and the comparison groups.

The Negro ESEA group (Table V) registered four significant negative shifts in means (Me, My Grades, My Future, My School), and three changes that were noteworthy (negative: Person I'd Like to Be, Teachers, Counselors). The comparison group made two significant changes (negative: My Classmates; positive: Most People), and four noteworthy shifts (positive: Me, My Future; negative: Teachers, My School).

Combined results for all QMOC groups (Table W) indicated that ESEA pupils were significantly negative in 3 of the 10 concepts (Me, My Grades, My School), while comparison pupils were the same on two concepts (Teacher, My School) and positive on another (Most People). The total comparison group also had three noteworthy mean shifts (negative: My Classmates; positive: My Grades, My Future).

Objectives: To identify health defects of children.
To correct dental defects in pupils.
To assist parents in obtaining appropriate health referral.

A registered nurse was assigned at mid-year to help the medical doctors and dentists and to screen project pupils in the determination of defects and necessary treatment. This nurse interviewed pupils and staff members, maintained records of contacts, reviewed pupil records, arranged pupil appointments, and made referrals. Also, she arranged for some project pupils to be treated on a continuing basis. Approximately 250 pupils were served, according to need.

The nurse's records (Table M) showed 116 pupil conferences, with 312 follow-up contacts of pupils with defects. Seventy-three of these pupils had defects corrected. The nurse also indicated that she had 120 conferences with parents in attempts to arrange medical appointments for the pupils. Table N shows that of 128 pupil defects detected 51 (40%) were corrected. Of those detected, 103 (80%) were visual or dental problems. There were nearly three times as many eye defects as dental defects detected, and over three times as many eye defects corrected. Also, 18 pupils were reported as still receiving treatment, but almost twice this number had not kept appointments that had been scheduled for them.

Table N gives a more complete picture than Table M of the kinds of health defects discovered and corrected. However, since health summaries were not kept on all project pupils, the totals in Table N are smaller than those in Table M.

Counselors also assisted in obtaining medical and dental appointments for pupils.

Objectives: To improve understanding of the effects of poverty on children.
To improve intergroup and intercultural understanding.
To improve teaching skills in specific instructional areas.
To improve skills and use of paraprofessionals.
To improve skills and use of supportive personnel.
To improve skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs.
To improve skills of participants in counseling with disadvantaged students.

Consulting counselors participated in seminars led by District personnel and other experts in the fields of psychology, education, sociology, and human relations. Workshops were designed to provide consulting counselors with skills in understanding and helping disadvantaged children improve their academic capabilities, understanding the environment of the disadvantaged, utilizing most effectively the skills of paraprofessionals and supportive personnel, providing counseling to disadvantaged children, and improving human relations, as well as to increase communication and understanding between the school and community. Workshop leaders utilized lectures, discussions, panels, role-playing sessions, sociodrama enactments, and audio presentations.

Eighty-nine project staff members replied to a staff development questionnaire (Table H) given to all ESEA personnel in both public and nonpublic schools. The NPS staff members attended the same workshops as their public school counterparts and were not required to identify on the questionnaire their NPS affiliation. For that reason, analysis of the ratings and comments by workshop participants applies to all respondents.

All workshop objectives were rated positively on a 1-5 ("Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree") scale. In their ratings respondents valued their improved counseling skills most highly, second only to their improved instructional and organizational skills. Concern was expressed for workshop presentations on the use of special equipment and on attitudes toward the effects of poverty on children.

The Intergroup Relations component, in cooperation with the District's Office of Urban Affairs, was planned to improve attitudes and to provide problem-solving situations in human relations for project pupils, staff members, and parents and other community members. There was no NPS participation in this component, according to the consulting counselors, because of an overlap in activities and an NPS administrative decision to give preference to activities already on the school calendar.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The ESEA pupils had an average IQ of 85.6; the comparison pupils, 100.3. The NPS selection of comparison schools did not accomplish ethnic and ability matching.

Central office personnel reported that none of the four schools in the program used common curricula in the three subjects under study. Therefore, such similarity as occurred in subject matter taught, especially in science, appeared to be coincidental.

Parents agreed strongly that schools should accept more of their solutions to school problems. While commenting that more parents were needed at meetings, they overwhelmingly supported the SAC program.

Staff members (Table H) rated the most effective feature of these components as aiding SAC teachers in working effectively with pupils, as least effective the detection of health defects. Comments by staff did not support their ratings, highlighting instead the need for more help from the central office in counseling, smaller classes, more humanistic teachers, a positive regard for the community aides and SAC nurse, and the start of consistent inservice earlier in the year.

Workshop participants provided ratings and comments on attainment of workshop objectives; methods of presenting workshop materials; and application of skills, understandings, and attitudes gained from workshop interactions. All median ratings of participants were positive. Improved counseling competency was rated highest, with writing of behavioral objectives next highest. Negative comments which clearly outnumbered positive, included the following:

> In general, the workshops were a waste of time.
>
> Persons who conduct workshops should be better prepared and know what they are attempting to do.
>
> Workshops were fine at first--then repetitious and boring.
>
> Like so many other of these workshops I felt it was a shameful waste of money.

TABLE A

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE, ALL PUPILS—CTBS RESULTS

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	91.7	2138	14.4 (5.2)[a]	16.0 (5.5)[a]	16.1
Comparison	90.9	351	15.6 (5.4)	16.5 (5.7)	15.8
				F(1,2485) =	1.506
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	91.7	2136	16.3 (4.4)	19.4 (4.6)	19.5
Comparison	90.8	351	17.1 (4.5)	18.4 (4.4)	18.0
				F(1,2483) =	24.827**
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	91.7	2147	10.5 (4.8)	12.4 (5.4)	12.4
Comparison	91.2	354	10.7 (4.8)	12.1 (5.3)	12.0
				F(1,2497) =	2.571
Language Expression					
ESEA	91.6	2137	10.5 (4.3)	13.1 (4.5)	13.1
Comparison	91.1	348	10.8 (4.4)	13.0 (4.5)	12.9
				F(1,2481) =	0.488
Language Spelling					
ESEA	91.7	2111	12.3 (5.3)	14.0 (5.5)	14.1
Comparison	91.1	335	13.2 (5.5)	14.2 (5.6)	13.7
				F(1,2442) =	2.265
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	91.6	2124	19.4 (5.4)	23.8 (6.0)	23.9
Comparison	91.2	350	20.5 (5.6)	23.4 (5.9)	22.7
				F(1,2470) =	9.404**
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	91.7	2109	11.2 (5.0)	13.9 (5.4)	14.0
Comparison	91.3	346	12.2 (5.3)	14.2 (5.5)	13.6
				F(1,2451) =	3.088
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	91.7	2049	6.7 (4.8)	8.3 (5.2)	8.3
Comparison	91.5	334	7.1 (5.0)	8.8 (5.6)	8.7
				F(1,2379) =	4.776*

Note.—Table A is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms Q and R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE B

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE, NEGRO PUPILS

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	91.2	1351	14.5 (5.2)[a]	16.3 (5.6)[a]	16.3
Comparison	90.1	207	15.3 (5.4)	16.2 (5.6)	15.7
				F(1,1554) =	3.805
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	91.1	1350	16.3 (4.4)	19.1 (4.5)	19.1
Comparison	90.1	207	17.0 (4.5)	18.2 (4.3)	17.9
				F(1,1553) =	10.238**
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	91.1	1346	10.8 (4.9)	12.0 (5.3)	12.0
Comparison	90.4	211	10.6 (4.8)	11.6 (5.1)	11.8
				F(1,1553) =	0.619
Language Expression					
ESEA	91.1	1339	10.6 (4.3)	12.9 (4.5)	12.9
Comparison	90.5	207	11.2 (4.6)	13.0 (4.5)	12.8
				F(1,1542) =	0.439
Language Spelling					
ESEA	91.1	1327	12.5 (5.3)	14.2 (5.6)	14.2
Comparison	90.2	197	13.4 (5.6)	14.3 (5.6)	13.8
				F(1,1520) =	2.241
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	91.0	1348	19.3 (5.4)	22.7 (5.7)	22.7
Comparison	90.4	204	19.4 (5.4)	22.3 (5.6)	22.2
				F(1,1548) =	0.814
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	91.1	1344	11.3 (5.1)	13.8 (5.3)	13.8
Comparison	90.6	203	11.8 (5.2)	13.6 (5.2)	13.3
				F(1,1543) =	2.586
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	91.1	1295	6.6 (4.8)	8.1 (5.2)	8.1
Comparison	90.8	195	6.6 (4.8)	8.2 (5.3)	8.2
				F(1,1486) =	0.458

Note.—Table B is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms Q and R, Level 3 Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE C

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE, MEXICAN AMERICAN PUPILS

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	92.6	728	14.2(5.1)[a]	15.5(5.4)[a]	15.5
Comparison	90.9	98	15.2(5.4)	16.5(5.6)	15.9
				F(1,822) =	0.622
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	92.4	725	16.1(4.3)	19.9(4.7)	19.9
Comparison	90.7	98	16.6(4.4)	17.6(4.2)	17.5
				F(1,819) =	20.105**
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	92.5	734	10.0(4.7)	13.0(5.6)	13.1
Comparison	91.4	98	10.3(4.8)	12.2(5.3)	12.1
				F(1,828) =	3.582
Language Expression					
ESEA	92.5	732	10.2(4.1)	13.3(4.6)	13.2
Comparison	91.1	96	9.8(4.0)	12.5(4.2)	12.7
				F(1,824) =	1.622
Language Spelling					
ESEA	92.4	717	11.9(5.2)	13.5(5.3)	13.5
Comparison	91.2	97	12.1(5.2)	13.4(5.3)	13.3
				F(1,810) =	0.266
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	92.7	721	19.4(5.3)	25.6(6.2)	25.7
Comparison	91.1	108	20.2(5.5)	22.2(5.6)	21.8
				F(1,825) =	24.003**
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	92.6	710	10.8(4.8)	14.1(5.4)	14.2
Comparison	91.2	105	12.0(5.2)	13.6(5.2)	13.0
				F(1,811) =	6.629*
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	92.7	699	6.8(4.9)	8.6(5.5)	8.6
Comparison	91.1	103	7.0(5.0)	8.6(5.5)	8.6
				F(1,798) =	0.010

Note.—Table C is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms Q and R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE D

PUPILS MEETING OR EXCEEDING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE

SUBTEST	Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade 9		
	N of Pupils Tested	N of Pupils Advancing 8 Mos. or More	Percentage	N of Pupils Tested	N of Pupils Advancing 8 Mos. or More	Percentage	N of Pupils Tested	N of Pupils Advancing 8 Mos. or More	Percentage
READING									
Vocabulary	1127	307	27	897	293	33	528	145	27
Comprehension	1126	328	29	893	313	35	531	154	29
Total Reading	1108	289	27	876	308	35	511	138	27
LANGUAGE									
Mechanics	1127	412	37	897	390	43	511	229	44
Expression	1123	352	31	898	330	37	511	173	33
Spelling	1121	390	35	894	302	34	510	157	30
Total Language	1100	339	31	871	320	37	495	151	30
ARITHMETIC									
Computation	1139	426	37	884	326	37	519	244	48
Concepts	1142	402	35	879	360	41	512	205	40
Application	1132	317	28	871	292	34	505	188	37
Total Arithmetic	1115	363	33	858	329	38	494	189	38

Note.—Table D is based on Comprehensive Tests Basic Skills pre- and posttest grade equivalents. Statistical analysis was performed by Roster SW1 computer program on an IBM System/360.

TABLE E

PUPILS ACHIEVING AT OR ABOVE GRADE EQUIVALENT (GE)

GRADE AND SUBTEST	TOTAL PUPILS TESTED	POST - 6/70 GE 8.0 OR HIGHER	PERCENTAGE
GRADE 7			
Reading			
Vocabulary	1127	38	3
Comprehension	1126	30	3
Language			
Mechanics	1127	144	13
Expression	1123	68	6
Spelling	1121	108	10
Arithmetic			
Computation	1139	132	12
Concepts	1142	80	7
Applications	1132	41	4
GRADE 8		GE 9.0 OR HIGHER	
Reading			
Vocabulary	897	55	6
Comprehension	893	43	5
Language			
Mechanics	897	140	16
Expression	898	67	7
Spelling	894	125	14
Arithmetic			
Computation	884	82	9
Concepts	879	50	6
Applications	871	26	3
GRADE 9		GE 10.0 OR HIGHER	
Reading			
Vocabulary	528	22	4
Comprehension	531	10	2
Language			
Mechanics	511	74	14
Expression	511	19	4
Spelling	510	32	6
Arithmetic			
Computation	519	20	4
Concepts	512	11	2
Applications	505	14	3

Note.—Table E is based on Comprehensive Tests Basic Skills posttesting results. Statistical analysis was performed by Roster SW1 computer program on an IBM System/360.

TABLE F

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE—PRESCRIPTIVE AND NONPRESCRIPTIVE TEACHERS

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
Prescriptive	92.4	490	13.7 (4.9)	16.0 (5.5)	16.6
Nonprescriptive	92.1	1692	14.6 (5.2)[a]	15.9 (5.5)[a]	15.7
				F(1,2178) =	12.132**
Reading Comprehension					
Prescriptive	92.4	485	16.0 (4.3)	19.0 (4.5)	19.2
Nonprescriptive	92.0	1701	16.5 (4.4)	19.4 (4.6)	19.4
				F(1,2182) =	0.168
Language Mechanics					
Prescriptive	92.1	492	10.9 (4.9)	12.1 (5.3)	11.9
Nonprescriptive	92.7	1699	10.5 (4.8)	12.4 (5.4)	12.5
				F(1,2187) =	6.304*
Language Expression					
Prescriptive	92.2	494	10.4 (4.2)	12.6 (4.2)	12.7
Nonprescriptive	92.7	1686	10.6 (4.3)	13.2 (4.6)	13.1
				F(1,2176) =	6.144*
Language Spelling					
Prescriptive	92.2	489	12.2 (5.2)	13.5 (5.3)	13.6
Nonprescriptive	92.7	1664	12.4 (5.3)	13.9 (5.4)	13.9
				F(1,2149) =	1.708
Arithmetic Computation					
Prescriptive	92.4	686	18.7 (5.1)	23.6 (5.9)	24.1
Nonprescriptive	91.7	1170	19.7 (5.4)	23.5 (5.9)	23.3
				F(1,1852) =	5.403*
Arithmetic Concepts					
Prescriptive	92.4	681	10.9 (4.8)	13.9 (5.3)	14.0
Nonprescriptive	91.8	1162	11.4 (5.0)	13.7 (5.2)	13.6
				F(1,1839) =	4.362*
Arithmetic Applications					
Prescriptive	92.5	666	6.8 (4.8)	8.0 (5.2)	8.0
Nonprescriptive	91.7	1126	6.7 (4.7)	8.2 (5.3)	8.3
				F(1,1788) =	3.784

Note.—Table F is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form Q and R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE G

DISTRIBUTION BY IQ OF NONSTANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT SCORES

IQ RANGE AND GROUP	READING Mean IQ	READING Mean Raw Score	READING N	ARITHMETIC Mean IQ	ARITHMETIC Mean Raw Score	ARITHMETIC N
- 70						
ESEA	67.6	16.8	11	68.5	8.0	2
AB938	65.0	16.5	13	64.8	7.4	9
71 - 85						
ESEA	80.6	18.4	179	80.5	8.7	65
AB938	79.4	17.5	132	79.5	9.2	122
86 - 100						
ESEA	92.5	20.1	539	91.5	9.7	123
AB938	92.9	21.9	210	92.7	12.0	193
101 - 115						
ESEA	105.6	21.5	156	105.5	11.0	29
AB938	107.3	26.7	124	107.2	14.6	112
116 - 130						
ESEA	119.6	24.4	11	119.0	15.0	2
AB938	121.0	28.2	34	120.7	15.4	32
131 - 145						
ESEA	--	--	--	--	--	--
AB938	136.0	30.5	8	135.7	16.9	7
Total Scores Regardless of IQ						
ESEA	92.5	20.0	896	90.1	9.6	221
AB938	94.8	22.4	522	94.9	12.1	476
Total Possible Raw Score		40			21	

Note.—Table G is based on scores from Reading Review No. I and Arithmetic Review No. I, teacher-made achievement tests. Statistical analysis was performed by Quick Median SWI computer program on an IBM System/360.

TABLE H

STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

ITEM	FREQUENCY						MEDIAN
	Does Not Apply 0	Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5	
17. My attitude toward the effects of poverty on children had improved.	1	9	19	0	4	3	2.0
18. I now have a better understanding of intergroup relations.	3	5	30	3	6	3	2.1
19. In my specific area, my instructional skills have not improved.	3	7	5	1	19	24	4.3[a]
20. My skills in organizing for instruction (grouping of students, use of resource and teacher aides, etc.) have improved.	1	20	23	1	3	0	1.7
21. For me, writing behavioral objectives has become more difficult.	3	3	4	2	16	25	4.5[a]
22. I have been able to use special equipment with greater ease.	3	8	22	2	5	2	2.0
23. My diagnoses of individual learning deficiencies have improved.	0	9	39	0	3	2	1.9
24. I feel that I am better able to motivate students.	1	15	25	1	4	2	1.8
25. My skill in developing new curriculum materials has improved.	1	15	27	0	1	1	1.8
26. I am more confused about how to evaluate pupils.	0	0	3	0	27	22	4.4[a]
27. My counseling skills have not improved.	1	1	4	1	13	21	4.8[a]
28. I feel I can work more effectively with other school personnel.	0	18	23	1	4	5	1.8
29. I think that the workshop leadership was outstanding.	1	21	22	2	8	3	1.8

(Continued)

TABLE H (Cont.)

ITEM	FREQUENCY						MEDIAN
	Does Not Apply 0	Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5	
30. The workshop(s) did not hold my interest.	0	5	13	1	26	24	4.0[a]
31. My prescriptive teaching techniques in math and/or reading have improved.	0	15	26	0	5	1	1.8
32. Workshop techniques I have applied have had a positive effect on students.	0	13	29	0	2	1	1.8
Average median response on all items							1.6[b]

Note.—Table H is based on Form 104B. Statistical analysis was performed by YTENUMERIC Tally and Analysis computer program on an IBM System/360. Max. N = 69

[a]The negative wording of the item has reversed the direction of the 1-5 scale.

[b]In computing this average median, the medians marked [a] have been reversed.

TABLE I

PUPIL EVALUATION

ITEM	FREQUENCY Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5	MEDIAN
11. I find that my ability to read has improved.	152	290	65	30	11	1.9
12. I can do arithmetic problems now which I could not do before.	217	209	63	39	22	1.8
13. I feel that it is harder to talk to my parents.	34	40	116	190	166	3.9[a]
14. I get along better with other kinds of kids.	76	176	180	75	41	2.6
15. I see more slides and movies now.	62	121	101	145	119	3.4
16. I have not received the help I need from the SAC nurse.	58	64	210	111	100	3.2[a]
17. My parents are more willing to take me to the doctor or dentist.	135	152	139	68	49	2.4
18. My teachers give me more attention (than when I was in the regular school program).	167	178	82	72	49	2.1
19. My dental problems have not been taken care of.	56	107	100	182	93	3.5[a]
20. I can talk to my counselor when I need to.	141	228	73	65	41	2.1
21. I would rather be in a SAC class than in a regular class.	173	129	109	58	76	2.3
22. The teacher aide helps me a lot.	194	196	78	32	45	1.9

Note.—Table I is based on Form 101G. Statistical analysis was performed by YTENUMERIC Tally and Analysis computer program on an IBM System/360. Max. N = 550

[a]Higher ratings here favor the program, since the item is worded negatively.

TABLE J

PARENT EVALUATION

ITEM	FREQUENCY Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5	MEDIAN
9. The information I received from the school about the SAC program is very adequate.	25	27	6	2	5	1.8
10. My child is reading better now than before (when he was <u>not</u> in the SAC program).	21	22	11	0	0	1.8
11. I feel that the teaching that goes on in the SAC program is good.	29	36	4	2	0	1.7
12. My child needs more help in his arithmetic skills.	23	16	10	4	1	1.8
13. The schools should accept more parents' solutions for school problems.	34	22	13	1	0	1.6
14. The inservice meetings which I have attended have been very helpful.	24	31	4	2	3	1.8
15. As a parent, I have found it difficult this year to get medical or dental care for my child.	3	4	19	16	10	3.5[a]
16. The community is eager to attend committee meetings.	3	10	24	14	17	3.4
17. I find that other committee members are easy to work with.	12	37	11	1	2	2.0

Note.—Table J is based on Form 102A. Max. N = 71.
[a]Higher ratings here favor the program, since the item is worded negatively.

TABLE K

STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

ITEM	FREQUENCY						MEDIAN
	Does Not Apply 0	Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5	
1. Pupils in SAC should now read better than comparable non-SAC pupils.	0	14	10	2	5	0	1.7
2. SAC pupils' arithmetic skills should improve while they are in the program.	0	8	16	5	2	0	2.0
3. Many health defects in SAC pupils persist undetected.	0	11	20	0	0	0	1.7
4. Dental defects in SAC pupils seem to linger despite efforts to alleviate them.	0	1	10	6	10	4	3.3[a]
5. SAC parents prefer to make their own dental appointments.	0	4	5	20	1	1	2.8
6. SAC parents prefer to make their own health appointments.	0	0	5	24	2	0	2.9
7. A child has a better attitude toward school and education when he is in SAC.	1	0	5	20	5	0	3.0
8. While participating in SAC enrichment and motivational activities, SAC pupils have gained some of the experiences of advantaged pupils.	0	8	11	7	5	0	2.2
9. I have found that SAC parents are easier to work with than non-SAC parents.	0	11	12	2	5	1	1.9
10. Many health defects in SAC pupils persist untreated.	0	3	10	16	2	0	2.7[a]
11. I always can secure help when necessary from the various non-teaching personnel.	0	3	6	12	7	3	3.0
12. Learning tools (such as tape recorders, film strip projectors, etc.) are always available when I need them.	0	11	13	4	3	0	1.9

(Continued)

TABLE K (Cont.)

ITEM	FREQUENCY: Does Not Apply 0	Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5	MEDIAN
13. SAC personnel are skilled in recognizing the specific learning problem of children.	0	10	12	2	6	1	2.0
14. I wish to continue working in SAC next semester.	0	5	16	5	4	1	2.2
15. Counseling personnel have succeeded in helping SAC teachers work effectively with pupils.	0	24	3	2	1	1	1.2

Note.—Table K is based on Form 103B. Statistical analysis was performed by YTENUMERIC Tally and Analysis computer program on an IBM System/360. Max. N = 31

[a]Higher ratings here favor the program, since the item is worded negatively.

TABLE I.

TALLY RECORD OF COUNSELING ACTIVITIES

ITEM	PUBLIC TALLY	NONPUBLIC TALLY
SERVICES TO PUPILS		
1. Individual counseling	6045	502
2. Group counseling	1052	46
3. Guidance activities	1215	67
4. Guidance conferences	2930	20
5. Intake process (screening, selection, placement, programming)	3386	29
6. Pupil appraisal	2401	111
7. Recording on cums, interview notes, etc.	6252	306
CONSULTATION WITH:		
8. SAC Teachers	3555	197
9. Non-SAC Teachers	2285	120
10. SAC Counselors	3798	0
11. Non-SAC Counselors	1944	5
12. Head Counselors	1412	3
13. Administrators	1326	245
14. Compensatory Education Coordinator	2311	2
15. Education Aide III	2738	0
16. Community Aide	1739	2
17. Doctor	459	1
18. Nurse	882	49
19. Health Aide	815	0
20. Community agency	760	11

(Continued)

TABLE L (Cont.)

ITEM	PUBLIC TALLY	NONPUBLIC TALLY
CONSULTATION WITH:		
Parents:		
21. at school	1009	43
22. at home	1010	0
23. by phone	2127	37
24. in groups	274	4
STAFF DEVELOPMENT		
25. Inservice, local school	406	26
26. Inservice, central office	437	30
27. SAC staff meeting, local school	581	11
28. Training Counselor Intern	5038	156
29. Student intergroup meetings	441	1
OTHER ACTIVITIES		
30. (Specify)	1268	38
31. (Specify)	1369	21

Note.—Table L is based on Form 103A. Statistical analysis was performed by YTENUMERIC Tally and Analysis computer program on an IBM System/360. Public maximum N = 21; nonpublic maximum N = 2.

TABLE M

TALLY OF SCHOOL NURSE'S HEALTH SERVICES

	ITEM	PUBLIC TALLY	NONPUBLIC TALLY
1.	Readmissions	0	4
2.	Exclusions	5	18
3.	Pupil conferences	2209	116
4.	Parent conferences	899	120
5.	School personnel conferences	2159	61
6.	Case conferences	38	58
7.	Health education (formal)	3	0
8.	First aid	2	95
9.	Referrals	1272	85
10.	Number of pupils with defects reported	693	157
11.	Number of pupils with defects followed-up	2123	312
12.	Number of pupils with defects corrected	352	73
13.	Home visits	226	40
14.	Pupils processed other than readmissions, exclusions, and first aid	1822	119
15.	Vision screened	1014	512
16.	Immunizations	0	0

Note.—Table M is based on Form 33.182. Statistical analysis was performed by YTENUMERIC Tally and Analysis computer program on an IBM System/360. Public maximum N = 2; nonpublic maximum N = 1.

TABLE N

SUMMARY OF HEALTH DEFECTS DETECTED AND CORRECTED

DEFECT	PUBLIC		NONPUBLIC	
	Detected	Corrected	Detected	Corrected
Eyes	107	71	77	36
Ear-Nose-Throat	46	19	13	5
Skin	10	5	2	0
CNS (Central Nervous System)	13	2	1	0
CVS (Cardiovascular System)	18	4	0	0
Respiratory	11	0	4	0
Abdomen	9	3	0	0
GU (Genitourinary)	5	3	0	0
Extremities	20	5	5	0
Dental	115	49	26	10
Total	354	161	128	51

REASON DEFECTS WERE NOT CORRECTED	PUBLIC TALLY	NONPUBLIC TALLY
Parents have not followed through with medical referral.	40	32
Child is still undergoing medical treatment toward correcting the defect.	73	18
Child was not referred to medical care.	18	1
Child was referred and appointment has been made with medical agency.	25	17
Total	156	68

Note.—Table N is based on Form 011HPS. Statistical analysis was performed by YTENUMERIC Tally and Analysis computer program on an IBM System/360. Public unduplicated N = 291; nonpublic unduplicated N = 187.

TABLE O

MEAN SCORES[a] FOR QUICK MEASURE OF CONCEPTS (QMOC)—NEGRO PUPILS

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	604	29.2	29.5	.41
Comparison	173	29.0	28.8	.48
MY GRADES				
ESEA	604	28.8	28.3	.34
Comparison	173	29.0	27.2**	.48
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	604	30.8	31.6 **	.28
Comparison	173	31.0	31.0	.40
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	604	25.4	25.3	.38
Comparison	173	25.3	23.8 **	.34
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	604	32.8	33.3	.21
Comparison	173	33.3	33.2	.49
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	604	29.1	29.8 *	.29
Comparison	173	30.1	29.2 *	.42
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	604	24.1	24.1	.38
Comparison	173	24.0	23.5	.33
TEACHERS				
ESEA	604	28.3	27.9	.34
Comparison	173	28.6	25.4 **	.42
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	604	29.9	30.1	.38
Comparison	173	30.3	28.7 **	.50
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	604	23.1	22.0 **	.42
Comparison	173	22.9	20.1 **	.43

Note.—Table O is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE P

MEAN SCORES[a] FOR QUICK MEASURE OF CONCEPTS (QMOC)—MEXICAN AMERICAN PUPILS

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	457	26.5	27.2 **	.37
Comparison	89	27.0	26.6	.48
MY GRADES				
ESEA	457	26.3	27.0 *	.33
Comparison	89	27.5	26.4	.42
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	457	28.8	30.3 **	.37
Comparison	89	30.3	29.7	.34
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	457	26.1	26.1	.28
Comparison	89	27.4	27.0	.48
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	457	31.4	32.2 **	.34
Comparison	89	32.9	32.5	.47
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	457	29.0	30.1 **	.38
Comparison	89	30.3	30.9	.27
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	457	25.3	25.3	.38
Comparison	89	24.5	24.6	.35
TEACHERS				
ESEA	457	27.4	27.6	.40
Comparison	89	28.0	28.0	.31
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	457	29.7	30.5 *	.28
Comparison	89	29.8	31.3 *	.38
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	457	25.3	24.5 *	.39
Comparison	89	26.7	25.4	.42

Note.—Table P is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE Q

MEAN SCORES[a] FOR QUICK MEASURE OF CONCEPTS (QMOC)—ALL PUPILS

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	1061	28.0	28.5 **	.43
Comparison	262	28.3	28.0	.50
MY GRADES				
ESEA	1061	27.7	27.7	.35
Comparison	262	28.4	26.9 **	.47
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	1061	30.0	31.0 **	.33
Comparison	262	30.8	30.5	.38
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	1061	25.7	25.7	.35
Comparison	262	26.0	24.9 *	.40
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	1061	32.2	32.8 **	.28
Comparison	262	33.1	33.0	.49
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	1061	29.1	30.0 **	.32
Comparison	262	30.2	29.8	.38
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	1061	24.6	24.6	.38
Comparison	262	24.2	23.9	.34
TEACHERS				
ESEA	1061	27.9	27.8	.37
Comparison	262	28.4	26.3 **	.38
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	1061	29.8	30.3	.34
Comparison	262	30.1	29.6	.45
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	1061	24.0	23.1 **	.42
Comparison	262	24.2	21.9 **	.46

Note.—Table Q is based on Form 103G. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE R

MEAN SCORES[a] FOR INTERCULTURAL MEASURE OF CONCEPTS (IMOC)

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
MY EDUCATION				
Negro	11	36.4	32.3	.24
Mexican American	18	37.8	36.4	.69
Both	29	37.2	34.8	.47
MY COUNTRY				
Negro	11	33.4	30.3	.73
Mexican American	18	31.6	34.6	.05
Both	29	32.2	33.0	.39
MEXICAN AMERICAN				
Negro	11	35.6	37.7	.39
Mexican American	18	34.0	34.5	.34
Both	29	34.6	35.7	.38
MOST PEOPLE				
Negro	11	33.4	29.3*	.35
Mexican American	18	34.1	34.2	.31
Both	29	33.8	32.3	.32
AFRO-AMERICANS				
Negro	11	32.9	38.2*	.55
Mexican American	18	34.9	36.6	.25
Both	29	34.2	37.2*	.31
MY NEIGHBORHOOD				
Negro	11	33.4	34.6	.56
Mexican American	18	37.6	37.8	.43
Both	29	36.0	36.6	.52
MY FREEDOM				
Negro	11	33.4	33.6	.42
Mexican American	18	30.7	33.8	.30
Both	29	31.7	33.8	.34
ORIENTALS				
Negro	11	31.9	31.1	.38
Mexican American	18	33.8	34.8	-.04
Both	29	33.1	33.4	.17
MYSELF				
Negro	11	31.2	36.5*	.81
Mexican American	18	42.5	41.4	.57
Both	29	38.2	39.5	.66
MY FUTURE				
Negro	11	31.7	34.7	.67
Mexican American	18	42.6	44.1	.57
Both	29	38.5	40.6	.74

(Continued)

TABLE R (Cont.)

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
MY CULTURE				
Negro	11	33.0	31.6	.76
Mexican American	18	38.6	39.7	.90
Both	29	36.5	36.6	.86
ANGLOS (WHITE)				
Negro	11	25.1	22.4	.43
Mexican American	18	29.9	28.8	.11
Both	29	28.1	26.3	.42

Note.—Table R is based on Form 105A. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 50. Scores on each of the 12 concepts rated in IMOC were based on a 5-point continuum scale for the following 16 paired qualities, 10 of which were specially selected for each concept: fast--slow; fair--unfair; good--bad; equal--unequal; helpful--harmful; honest--dishonest; strong--weak; pleasant--unpleasant; valuable--worthless; desirable--undesirable; right--wrong; desegregated--segregated; kind--cruel; happy--sad; beautiful--ugly; advantaged--disadvantaged.

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE S

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE, NPS ACHIEVEMENT TESTING

TEST, SUBTEST, AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS					
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	85.7	157	14.2 (5.1)[a]	15.5 (5.4)[a]	18.8
Comparison	100.7	90	24.5 (7.4)	26.3 (7.9)	20.5
				F(1,243) = 6.721*	
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	85.6	154	14.6 (4.0)	19.7 (4.6)	22.9
Comparison	100.7	90	25.4 (6.6)	28.2 (7.0)	22.9
				F(1,240) = 0.004	
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	85.4	157	18.7 (5.2)	22.7 (5.7)	26.0
Comparison	101.1	89	27.3 (6.6)	32.6 (7.7)	27.1
				F(1,242) = 1.068	
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	85.4	156	10.7 (4.7)	13.3 (5.1)	15.2
Comparison	101.1	89	16.8 (6.8)	20.0 (7.5)	16.6
				F(1,241) = 3.489	
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	85.5	154	6.5 (4.7)	8.3 (5.3)	9.8
Comparison	101.1	89	11.1 (6.6)	12.2 (6.9)	9.6
				F(1,239) = 0.130	
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT					
ESEA	86.0	154	18.8 (4.4)	23.5 (5.1)	27.4
Comparison	100.6	92	30.6 (6.2)	35.0 (6.8)	28.4
				F(1,242) = 1.052	

Note.—Table S is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms Q and R, Level 3, and on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Form Am, Intermediate Science. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent.

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE T

NPS PUPILS MEETING OR EXCEEDING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE (PO)
AND GRADE EQUIVALENT (GE)

TEST AND SUBTEST	Grade 7					Grade 8				
	N of Pupils Tested	N of Pupils Advancing 10 Mos. or More (PO)	Percentage	N of Pupils with GE 8.0 or Higher	Percentage	N of Pupils Tested	N of Pupils Advancing 10 Mos. or More (PO)	Percentage	N of Pupils with GE 9.0 or Higher	Percentage
COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS										
READING										
Vocabulary	90	24	27	0	0	82	15	18	1	1
Comprehension	87	36	41	4	5	82	30	36	0	0
Total Reading	87	28	32	0	0	81	22	27	0	0
ARITHMETIC										
Computation	84	16	19	1	1	87	42	48	6	7
Concepts	82	23	28	1	1	88	38	43	1	1
Application	82	31	38	2	2	88	25	28	2	2
Total Arithmetic	81	15	18	0	0	87	39	45	5	6
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS										
SCIENCE	71	29	41	0	0	100	25	25	0	0

Note.-Table T is based on pre- and posttest grade equivalents derived from scores on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms Q and R, Level 3, and on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Form Am, Intermediate Science. Statistical analysis was performed by Roster SWI computer program on an IBM System/360.

TABLE U

MEAN SCORES[a] FOR QUICK MEASURE OF CONCEPTS (QMOC)—NPS MEXICAN AMERICAN PUPILS

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	64	27.8	27.8	.45
Comparison	36	28.5	28.4	.64
MY GRADES				
ESEA	64	25.8	24.9	.62
Comparison	36	24.5	26.0	.64
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	64	30.3	30.3	.56
Comparison	36	31.4	32.5	.14
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	64	25.2	26.6	.31
Comparison	36	27.1	27.3	.48
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	64	32.8	32.5	.35
Comparison	36	32.4	33.0	.75
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	64	30.3	29.5	.51
Comparison	36	30.6	30.8	.39
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	64	26.4	24.4 *	.35
Comparison	36	25.8	26.5	.43
TEACHERS				
ESEA	64	27.0	27.5	.44
Comparison	36	29.9	26.1 **	.37
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	64	31.0	31.4	.44
Comparison	36	31.3	29.9	.16
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	64	26.7	26.3	.47
Comparison	36	28.9	26.8	.30

Note.—Table U is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE V

MEAN SCORES[a] FOR QUICK MEASURE OF CONCEPTS (QMOC) — NPS NEGRO PUPILS

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	81	30.1	28.2 **	.25
Comparison	26	28.5	29.5	.46
MY GRADES				
ESEA	81	28.6	26.6 **	.47
Comparison	26	27.9	28.5	.36
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	81	32.2	31.0 *	.37
Comparison	26	32.3	33.8	-.07
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	81	24.6	25.0	.33
Comparison	26	29.3	26.5 *	.26
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	81	33.7	32.4	.03
Comparison	26	34.4	35.0	.22
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	81	30.8	30.0	.36
Comparison	26	31.5	32.4	-.02
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	81	24.6	25.3	.20
Comparison	26	23.8	26.8 **	.46
TEACHERS				
ESEA	81	27.4	25.9	.51
Comparison	26	32.3	30.8	.55
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	81	32.2	30.6	-.01
Comparison	26	30.5	31.2	.36
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	81	27.8	25.7 *	.54
Comparison	26	31.3	29.5	.34

Note.—Table V is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE W

MEAN SCORES[a] FOR QUICK MEASURE OF CONCEPTS (QMOC)—ALL NPS PUPILS

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	145	29.1	28.0 **	.32
Comparison	62	28.5	28.9	.59
MY GRADES				
ESEA	145	27.3	25.9 **	.54
Comparison	62	25.9	27.1	.59
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	145	31.4	30.7	.46
Comparison	62	31.8	33.1	.09
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	145	24.9	25.7	.32
Comparison	62	28.0	26.9	.42
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	145	33.3	32.4	.15
Comparison	62	33.3	33.9	.71
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	145	30.6	29.8	.42
Comparison	62	31.0	31.4	.29
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	145	25.4	24.9	.24
Comparison	62	25.0	26.6 *	.43
TEACHERS				
ESEA	145	27.2	26.6	.48
Comparison	62	30.9	28.1 **	.45
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	145	31.7	30.9	.18
Comparison	62	31.0	30.5	.20
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	145	27.3	25.9 *	.50
Comparison	62	29.9	27.9 *	.34

Note.—Table W is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN

Abstract

Pupils	
Public Schools	552
Nonpublic Schools	327
Participating Institutions	20
Staff	
Certificated	23
Medical	4
Teacher Assistants	10
Inservice Participants	105
Approximate Cost	$137,418

Description: This project provided auxiliary services to designated institutions housing neglected and delinquent children. Services were designed to meet the diversified needs of these children in three phases: a therapeutic team, a summer school program, and four workshops. Component activities were planned by an advisory committee consisting of institution representatives, project personnel, and central office medical staff members.

The therapeutic team, consisting of an elementary counselor, two secondary counselors, a nurse, and a curriculum specialist, provided evaluation and counseling services to the pupils at the 20 institutions which participated during the regular school year and the 14 which were involved in the summer program. Physicians, nurses, and an audiometrist provided additional services.

In addition to the therapeutic team, the summer program added classroom activities and was tutorial in nature. Twenty certificated teachers and 10 teaching assistants were assigned to tutorial and/or remedial classes at institutional sites for a six-week session. Larger institutions were served by one, two, or three teachers. Smaller institutions had a teacher and/or assistant. This phase of the summer project served 314 pupils at the elementary or secondary level.

Four workshops, each with a duration of from 10 to 18 hours, were conducted for professional and paraprofessional staff members of 20 public schools and 20 institutions associated with the project. At the first and second inservice workshops, project staff members conducted discussions with institution staff members about the problems and needs of neglected and delinquent children. A third workshop, conducted for 25 public school teachers of neglected and/or delinquent children, pertained to the characteristics, needs, and problems of these children. This workshop was repeated for summer school teachers and staff.

Time Intervals: During the period from September 1, 1969, to August 31, 1970, the therapeutic team served 879 pupils from 20 institutions housing neglected and/or delinquent children of school age. Approximately 552 of these pupils

attended public schools for all or part of the regular school year, and 327 pupils involved in the component regularly attended nonpublic schools. An augmented summer program served pupils from July 6 through August 14, 1970.

Activities: Pupils with educational, social, behavioral, and health problems were referred to the therapeutic team, whose members provided institutional staff, teachers, and other personnel with the types of information necessary for complete educational planning. The principal activities of the counselors, as shown in their logs, were individual evaluations including achievement, ability, and psychological testing; coordination of conferences with parents, teachers, psychiatrists, social worker, houseparents, and school and institution administrators; individual and group counseling; vocational counseling; and classroom observation.

Objectives:

- To change (in a positive direction) the children's attitudes toward school and education
- To improve the physical health of the children
- To provide inservice education

Evaluation Strategy: Weekly logs, kept by counselors and the nurse on the therapeutic team, were analyzed. Participants in workshops answered questionnaires and rated the sessions.

Results: Twenty certificated teachers and 10 teaching assistants were assigned to tutorial and/or remedial classes for 314 pupils at institutional sites for a six-week session.

Supportive services were provided in the summer by two counselors, a school doctor, two nurses, and an audiometrist.

The doctor, assisted by the nurses, gave 280 regular physical examinations to those pupils entering public school in the fall.

The nurses provided vision screening for 553 children.

There were 492 referrals: 119 dental, 94 vision, 90 hearing, 60 skin, 59 ear, nose, and throat, 75 extremities, 23 respiratory, 8 abdomen, 4 genitourinary, 4 cardiovascular, and 10 miscellaneous.

For the full year, the audiometrist traveled to individual sites and gave 495 individual hearing tests.

The therapeutic team conducted two workshops, consisting of four sessions each, for a total of 38 houseparents, directors, counselors, and social workers from institutions serving neglected and delinquent children.

The highest median ratings for Workshops I and II (3.2 and 3.3, respectively, on a 1-4, low-high scale) were given to "Better communication and understanding among institution staff, school staff, and social welfare staff."

The highest median rating (3.9) for Workshop for Teachers of Neglected and Delinquent Children was given to "Group Therapy Session." The highest median rating (3.1) for Summer Workshop for Teachers of Neglected and Delinquent Children was given to "Diagnosis and Treatment of Learning Disorders."

Conclusions: Broadly supportive services (diagnostic, instructional, and remedial) were provided to meet the diversified needs of neglected and delinquent children.

An enriched program of supportive services was offered to these children during the summer.

Workshop training was integrally related to ongoing assignments, as far as both participants and leaders were concerned.

Participants in workshops preferred sessions involving demonstrations of techniques.

Recommendations: Expand tutorial services from the summer program to the full-year project.

Survey institutions in the program to determine their needs and priorities for next year's project.

Expand workshop sessions involving demonstrations of techniques to help neglected or delinquent children.

NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN

Detailed Report

Component objectives were evaluated utilizing the following: weekly logs, tallies of health services, and questionnaires completed by workshop participants.

Objective: To change (in a positive direction) the children's attitudes toward school and education.

The counselors on the therapeutic team directed their energies toward changing the children's attitudes toward school and education. They gave individual counseling to maladjusted children on approximately four days a week. From three to eight children were studied intensively each month. After reviewing the child's records and completing an evaluation, the counselor held a case conference and reported his findings and recommendations to one or more of the following: teacher, institution administrator, houseparent, and social worker.

Counselors used a filmstrip titled "Getting to Know Me" as a basis for group discussions for elementary level children. Daily logs kept by counselors indicated that an average of 15 group counseling sessions were held for children at participating institutions each month. The basic goal was to help pupils improve their attitudes.

Objective: To improve the physical health of the children.

Health services were provided by a school doctor, two nurses, and an audiometrist. The audiometrist traveled to individual sites and gave 495 individual hearing tests. The nurse on the therapeutic team coordinated dental surveys, TB testing, audiometrist's and physician's visits, vision screening, and speech referrals. She conducted programs on safety education; first aid; the effects of smoking, narcotics, and alcohol; and, for the older children, sex education. Both nurses provided vision screening for 553 children. They also taught health education and assisted a doctor who gave 280 regular physical examinations to those pupils entering public school in the fall. Pupils were referred for the remediation of physical defects. The number of children referred and the medical categories are as follows:

119 dental	23 respiratory
94 vision	8 abdomen
90 hearing	4 genitourinary
75 extremities	4 cardiovascular
60 skin	10 miscellaneous
59 ear-nose-throat	

Objective: To provide inservice education.

Members of the component's therapeutic team conducted two similar workshops consisting of four sessions each for a total of 38 houseparents, directors, counselors, and social workers from institutions serving neglected and delinquent

children. The purposes of the workshops were to develop participants' insights into counseling techniques, the emotional needs of children, and to improve communication and understanding among institutions, school, and social welfare staffs. Participants gave specific median ratings ranging from 2.5 to 3.3 on a 1-4 (low-high) scale (Tables A and B).

TABLE A

PARTICIPANT RATINGS OF WORKSHOP I FOR INSTITUTION PERSONNEL

ITEM	FREQUENCY				MEDIAN
	Not at All 1	Little 2	Some 3	Much 4	
How much did the four sessions of this workshop help you attain the following objectives?					
Insight into the growth and development needs and patterns of neglected and delinquent children.	2	4	6	5	3.0
Insight into the emotional needs and patterns of neglected and delinquent children.	1	4	6	5	3.0
Insight into counseling techniques and procedures which might be useful with various age groups.	1	5	4	5	3.0
Better communication and understanding among institution staff, school staff, and social welfare staff.	0	3	7	5	3.2
Understanding of the functions of the Los Angeles City Schools staff associated with the project.	0	6	2	6	3.0

Table A is based on Form 236A. N = 17

In response to an item asking for comments on valuable aspects of the workshop, 17 of 20 respondents mentioned the sharing of common problems and solutions with personnel of other institutions, and three mentioned clarifying the role of public schools in working with neglected and delinquent children.

TABLE B

PARTICIPANT RATINGS OF WORKSHOP II FOR INSTITUTION PERSONNEL

ITEM	FREQUENCY				MEDIAN
	Not at All 1	Little 2	Some 3	Much 4	
How much did the four sessions of this workshop help you attain the following objectives?					
Insight into the growth and development needs and patterns of neglected and delinquent children.	1	2	4	0	2.5
Insight into the emotional needs and patterns of neglected and delinquent children.	1	3	3	2	2.7
Insight into counseling techniques and procedures which might be useful with various age groups.	1	3	3	2	2.7
Better communication and understanding among institution staff, school staff, and social welfare staff.	0	1	4	4	3.3
Understanding of the functions of the Los Angeles City Schools staff associated with the project.	1	1	7	1	2.9

Table B is based on Form 236A. N = 10

A third workshop was held mainly for public school teachers of children from institutions. Participants in this workshop were asked to rate the value of each session in terms of the objective "To help teachers understand the special problems of teaching neglected and delinquent children." The results are shown in Table C.

4

TABLE C

PARTICIPANT RATINGS OF WORKSHOP FOR TEACHERS
OF NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN

MEETING		FREQUENCY No Value 1	Some Value 2	Much Value 3	Great Value 4	MEDIAN
Please rate the value of each session in terms of the following objective: To help teachers understand the special problems of teaching neglected and delinquent children.						
"Reality Therapy and the Delinquent" Mr. Joseph Peters	4/6	0	10	11	8	3.0
"Problems of Children in Institutions" Panel discussion	4/13	1	9	14	4	2.8
"Group Therapy Session" Panel discussion	4/20	0	2	5	22	3.9
"Diagnosis and Treatment of Learning Disorders" Dr. Frances Berres	4/27	3	10	9	4	2.5
"Assisting the Institutionalized Child in the Public Schools" Panel discussion	5/4	0	15	8	6	2.5
Overall rating of the series of meetings		0	3	20	7	3.1

Table C is based on Form 236B. N = 30

Comments on each of the sessions were also requested. Of 25 multiple responses on session one, 13 indicated more time was needed for adequate development of key concepts and techniques; and eight considered the session an excellent source of ideas and suggestions.

Of 16 responses on session two, 10 referred to the value of hearing about the variety of institutions, philosophies, methods, personnel, children and homes involved in the program. Four responses indicated the panel was a waste of time, either because it did not focus on children's problems or was repetitive.

Of 22 responses on session three, 18 stressed the value of seeing group therapy in action, with methods and outcomes revealed in clinical detail. Four pointed to the need for seeing additional sessions. Two commented only on the excellence of the session, as did all the other responses by implication.

Of 18 responses on session four, eight saw limited value because of their previous experience, but four pointed to valuable information gained.

A majority of the responses on session five welcomed a discussion of the various problems confronting those working with neglected and/or delinquent children. The few negative responses quarreled with the handling of subject matter, saying that it assumed too much background for some who came for help, provided too much philosophy, or was redundant. One response thought the session would have served better as the first in the series because it provided background material, whereas another response thought it was a good follow-up to the four previous meetings.

In commenting on the overall series of meetings, two out of three responses pointed to the new insights deriving from the workshop. Asked to explain any changes planned in the areas of education or counseling, 10 of the respondents indicated there would be greater realization of the need to understand neglected and delinquent children; five foresaw involving the children in solving their problems; three already had initiated group counseling; and another three were setting small, specific requirements for each student and trying to meet them.

Recommendations for improving this type of workshop were made. Of 28 multiple responses 11 called for more demonstrations or on-site observations, six asked for an expansion of the program (number of participants and length of sessions), five wanted more participation by neglected and delinquent children, and four advised more interaction among participants.

A fourth workshop was held during the summer for teachers and aides employed in the tutorial project. Participants were asked to rate each session as well as the overall series, and the results are shown in Table D.

TABLE D

PARTICIPANT RATINGS OF SUMMER WORKSHOP FOR TEACHERS OF NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN

MEETING		FREQUENCY No Value 1	Some Value 2	Much Value 3	Great Value 4	MEDIAN
Please rate the value of each session in terms of the following objective: To help teachers understand the special problems of teaching neglected and delinquent children.						
"Group Therapy" Mr. Ray Rodelander	7/15	0	7	9	3	2.8
"Reality Therapy" Mr. Joseph Peters	7/22	0	5	8	3	2.9
"Reality Therapy" Mr. Joseph Peters	7/29	2	10	6	0	2.3
"Diagnosis and Treatment of Learning Disorders" Dr. Frances Berres	8/5	0	3	12	5	3.1
"Learning Disorders" Dr. Frances Berres	8/12	0	4	9	4	3.0
Overall rating of the series of meetings		0	4	10	5	3.1

Table D is based on Form 236C. N = 20

Participants were also asked for their recommendations. Out of 24 multiple recommendations for improving the workshop, seven stressed avoiding repetition, particularly in the second of two sessions with the same speaker; six urged even greater use of practical content; four suggested a schedule that anticipates needs and notifies participants and speaker of what to expect from each other; two favored more discussion; two wanted on-site observations; and three made no recommendations.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES: SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM

Abstract

Schools	70
Personnel	17
Cost	$353,000

Description: The School-Community Relations Program was a field operation which provided liaison services between target area schools and the community. These services were designed to improve home-school communication, maintain a constant and positive interaction between school and community, assist school personnel and school patrons in the mutually satisfactory disposition of school-related problems, interpret community attitudes to school personnel, and involve lay leadership in the extension of the educational program.

Three teams, each staffed with a specialist and from three to five consultants, were assigned to specific geographic locations. Team members were housed at either administrative or non-school sites within their assigned communities. Administrative direction for the component was provided by the Office of Urban Affairs.

Time Intervals: This component served the elementary and secondary schools in the period from September 1969 through August 1970. Team members were assigned on the basis of a 40-hour week; however, services often were provided in the evenings and on weekends.

Activities: Staff activities included assisting parents in the solution of school-related problems, bringing community concerns to the attention of school personnel, identifying and interpreting to school personnel the cultural backgrounds of the community, interpreting District policies to individuals or groups, arranging meetings between community groups and school administrators for amelioration of concerns, serving on advisory committees, and organizing teacher inservice education programs related to school-community relations. These services were provided, as needed, in response to school and community requests. Inservice education for project personnel was provided through participation in human relations workshops, periodic general staff meetings, and weekly unit meetings.

Objective:

- To improve home-school communication

Evaluation Strategy: Questionnaires were used to assess the reactions of school administrators and of community persons having contact with the program. The activities of project personnel were summarized weekly and analyzed. Project

personnel completed questionnaires relating to accomplishments of the current year and projected needs for next year. In addition, a questionnaire was completed by principals of schools which were served in the previous year but not in the current year.

Results: Thirty-four percent of community respondents mentioned the improvement of communication between school and home as a strength of the component.

Ninety-six percent of these respondents stated that the component should be continued.

Ten of 34 principals did not favor continuation of the program.

Community contacts gave median ratings of 3.6 on a low-high, 1-4 scale to the items "The Community Relations Consultant helps with problems between schools and the community" and "Helped me to become active in school affairs."

Principals gave median ratings of 3.0 on a low-high, 1-4 scale to items concerned with assistance in contacts with parents who have difficulty communicating with the schools, objectivity of consultants, and availability of consultants.

Conclusions: Most community contacts agreed that the component helped with school-related problems. More than 90% of these respondents rated the program as valuable.

Most principals agreed that consultants assisted in communicating with parents.

Staff consultants felt that one of their most important contributions was assistance in the formation and operation of local school advisory councils.

Most persons involved in the component recommended that it be continued.

Recommendations: Increase efforts to involve parents in school-related activities.

Increase use of consultant services at the secondary level.

Expand inservice education for project personnel, school administrators, and community persons.

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM

Detailed Report

The broad purposes of this component were the improvement of home-school communication and the involvement of community persons in the educational program. The degree of achievement of these objectives was evaluated through questionnaires designed to obtain the reactions of community persons served by the consultants and by other ESEA school personnel.

Objective: To improve home-school communication.

Community contacts numbering 425, most of them parents of children in ESEA schools, were asked to respond to a questionnaire. One hundred thirty-nine (33%) answered a question on the value of the overall program as follows: "No value," 2; "Little value," 11; "Much value," 57; and "Great value," 69. More than 90% of the respondents considered the program valuable. Responses to other questions on specific facets of the program are shown in Table A.

TABLE A
RATINGS BY COMMUNITY CONTACTS

ITEM	FREQUENCY Disagree 1	2	3	Agree 4	MEDIAN
The Community Relations Consultant:					
Understands the community and its problems	7	2	63	71	3.5
Helps parents tell their feelings about schools	11	16	48	72	3.5
Helps parents learn more about schools	7	11	55	74	3.5
Helps people in the community have more trust in the schools	11	19	51	61	3.3
Helps with problems between schools and the community	8	12	44	80	3.6
Is fair in his dealings with the community	6	6	61	67	3.5
Is easy to talk to	4	8	48	86	3.7
Makes it easier for parents to talk to school people	7	10	57	71	3.5
Helped me to become active in school affairs	11	7	31	65	3.6

Table A is based on Form 280C. N = 147

The 139 community persons contacted, asked to comment on the program, made multiple responses. Of 143 responses to the question "What are some of the strong points of this program?" 53 indicated improved communication between school and community; 23 focused on the unique competence of the consultants, especially as they were culturally attuned to the community; 21 pointed to increased understanding, particularly of the parents for the school situation; 12 remarked on the new involvement, mostly by parents, with the school program; nine were impressed with the program's guiding principles. Eighteen offered no comment, and seven saw little or no strength in the program.

Community contacts were asked to suggest improvements in the SCRC program. Of 163 responses 32 called for expansion of the program, primarily so the consultant could work more intensively; 28 called for freeing the consultant of administrative restraints; 17 wanted closer attention to community orientation by consultants; 17 saw ways to increase parent involvement; 10 had ideas for increasing liaison with the community; 10 urged publicizing the purpose of the program; eight asked simply for a continuation of the program, seven wanted closer attention paid to the consultant's background; five proposed a new look at the program's objectives; four outlined measures for promoting harmony; and four requested delineation of appropriate duties and hours for consultants. Twenty-one made no suggestions. In response to the question "Should the program be continued," 135 said yes, five said no, and three had no opinion.

Weekly logs maintained by the consultants indicated that parents were assisted continuously in understanding the educational program. Community Relations consultants helped organize local school advisory councils, curriculum study groups, and parent volunteer groups. Topics covered in these programs included scores on the state-mandated tests in reading and mathematics, results of the implementation of programmed reading, dissemination of information on a summer inservice education program for parents desiring to serve on school advisory councils, and the need for volunteers for tutorial projects.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Project personnel were asked to describe the most significant accomplishments of the program for this school year. The seven consultants who replied stressed closer cooperation between school and community, greater parent involvement, and assistance in the formation and operation of local school advisory councils. Recommendations for next year stressed expansion of staff development programs and greater utilization of consultant services at the secondary level.

Eighty-five percent of the principals of the 70 target area schools responded to a questionnaire. Their agreement or disagreement with a series of statements concerning the program is shown in Table B. Asked if they favored continuation of the program, 24 principals said yes, 10 said no, and the remainder gave to response. When asked what they considered the most important contributions of the School-Community Relations Program to their school/office and community, 19 mentioned liaison with parents and community, six pointed to indoctrination about the school program, five referred to troubleshooting and general availability, and three specified innovative programs. Eleven saw little or no contributions by the program.

TABLE B

PRINCIPALS' RATINGS

ITEM	FREQUENCY Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Strongly Agree 4	MEDIAN
The School-Community Relations program generally contributed information and services useful in formulating decisions concerning problems of school-community relations.	8	7	16	11	2.9
The activities of this program have increased community confidence in the schools.	10	7	12	13	2.8
This program facilitates contact with parents who have difficulty communicating with the schools.	6	8	18	13	3.0
Consultants kept the school well informed about events and feelings within the community.	11	10	14	10	2.6
Consultants effectively assisted the schools in coping with community grievances.	11	10	11	11	2.6
Consultants were objective in their handling of relationships between the school and the community.	7	4	19	10	3.0
Consultants were readily available to the school when needed.	5	6	18	12	3.0
This program provided a resource for developing inservice programs in school-community relations for school staff.	7	11	5	2	2.0
Consultants served as connectors with community agencies.	6	9	13	11	2.8

Table B is based on Form 280A. N = 45

School principals also were asked what they recommended to increase the effectiveness of the program. Of 36 responses 10 called for expansion of consultant assignments, primarily in more hours per school; eight suggested certain qualifications for personnel; six urged more intercommunication between the consultant and other parties; and eight saw no need for the program, particularly where the function already was being served by other means. Four had no recommendations.

In rating the extent to which the School-Community Relations consultants possessed characteristics necessary for carrying out their assignments, 80% of the principals stated that the consultants had "some" or "much" ability to work understandingly with parents and community groups. Other ratings are shown in Table C.

TABLE C

CONSULTANT ABILITIES

ITEM	FREQUENCY					MEDIAN
	No Opportunity To Observe	None 1	Little 2	Some 3	Much 4	
Ability to work understandingly with school personnel	2	3	6	19	14	3.1
Ability to work understandingly with parents and community groups	2	0	7	19	16	3.2
Ability to make effective written and oral communications	5	0	7	19	13	3.2
Leadership abilities	2	3	8	20	10	3.0

Table C is based on Form 280A. N = 44

Principals of schools not included in the 1969-70 SCRC program but previously assigned a Community Relations consultant were asked if they would choose to have a consultant again, if funds were available. Of 116 replies, 40 (34%) said yes, 39 (34%) said no, 30 were uncertain, and seven said they had no basis for evaluation.

In addition, there were 92 pertinent comments. Of these, 24 indicated unqualified assent, either because the school missed the good overall community liaison program it had last year, or because it saw a need for a consultant's help with special problems. Thirty-four qualified their assent; of these, more than half said that any benefit they received and/or would receive from the program was dependent upon the capabilities and loyalty of their consultants. Some even emphasized they should be included in the selection of their consultants; others

stressed that the consultant should not work at cross purposes with the school. About a third of the principals who qualified their assent attested that their basic need for the program was not being met generally, because the consultant was not an integral part of the school staff. Five said the program was good but felt they had no need for it in their school.

Twenty-seven rejected the program, most because they saw little or no need for it, others because they had made their own provision for the program or thought the funds could better be spent on other services, and some on the grounds that the consultants worked against the school by encouraging criticism of the school by the community.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY: SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Abstract

Pupils	797
Public Schools	2
Nonpublic Schools	3
Personnel	39
Cost	Approx. $244,000

Description: The public school program involved the implementation of an educational Assessment-Service Center designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged, physically handicapped pupils. The assessment component of the Center gathered essential data and identified deficiencies on an individual basis. Teachers trained in assessing learning disabilities determined each pupil's level of mastery. They also made an in-depth assessment of the child's assets and limitations and prepared specific recommendations for effective remediation of these disabilities. The service component provided instruction tailored to the individual needs of pupils. Teachers of pupils who had been served by the Assessment Center utilized the individual recommendations. Instructional services were provided in reading, language, and mathematics for 310 physically handicapped, disadvantaged children.

A nonpublic school component provided compensatory educational services to 487 handicapped pupils residing in the District's target area. Personnel involved included teachers, counselors, speech therapists, psychologists, social workers, psychiatric social workers, teacher aides, nurses, and an audiologist. The audiologist and one speech therapist were located at the Center for the Study of Speech and Hearing, which is sponsored by the University of Southern California. Transportation to the Center was provided for pupils who needed it. Case studies, including recommendations, were prepared for each child, and if a child obtained a hearing aid, the audiologist oriented him in its use. If a child needed speech therapy, it was provided by the speech teacher.

Inservice education for nonpublic school teachers was provided through a Prescriptive Teaching Center staffed with a resident ESEA teacher and aide who supervised the teaching of pupils brought to the Center for assistance. Teacher participants observed demonstrations of teaching techniques, studied the teaching model developed by Prof. Laurence J. Peter of the University of Southern California, and taught pupils at the Center.

Time Intervals: All activities except the Speech and Hearing Center operated from September 1969 through June 1970. The Speech and Hearing Center served pupils from September 1969 through August 1970.

Activities: Instructional activities in the lower grades stimulated reading readiness by the use of phonic word builder sets, sentence builders, reading readiness charts, handwriting charts, and flannel boards. Pupils in upper

grades were given drills in linguistic and auditory skills, including articulation and the ability to follow directions. Pupils in the mathematics component were given drills in fundamental operations and processes.

Teachers in the assessment component gathered essential data and identified deficiencies on an individual basis. The speech teachers in the nonpublic school component assessed pupil language abilities and provided speech therapy when necessary. Inservice education was given to public school teachers during a four-day workshop. Nonpublic school teachers received inservice education at the local university.

Objectives:
- To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests
- To identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process
- To provide inservice education

Evaluation Strategy: Standardized measuring instruments were used to evaluate the degree of success in achievement of component objectives. Pre- and posttest results were compared in a one-group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data. Questionnaires completed by project participants were also used to evaluate component effectiveness.

Results: Fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in the language development component gained the equivalent of 12, 11, and 8 months, respectively, in achievement during the seven months of instruction between pre and post administration of the reading subtests of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS).

The increase in median grade equivalent for pupils in grades two and three on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test was three months over the seven-month interval between tests.

Fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in the mathematics component gained 10, 9, and 12 months, respectively, during the 6.5 months between pre- and posttests on the arithmetic subtests of the CTBS.

Pupils in grades four, five, and six achieved in mathematics at grade equivalents of 3.2, 2.3, and 2.9, respectively.

Speech and language evaluations were given to 51 nonpublic school children, and 22 received speech therapy on a regular basis.

Conclusions: Gains in mathematics exceeded a month in achievement per month of instruction. However, levels of achievement were considerably below expectancy for grades four, five, and six, respectively.

Learning deficiencies of public and nonpublic school pupils were identified. Specific recommendations for remediation of disabilities were provided in the areas of reading, mathematics, and language.

Recommendations: Stress greater individualization of instruction.

Provide inservice education to teachers in techniques of implementing new language sequences.

Stress fundamental processes and operations in mathematics.

Expand the Intergroup Relations and Parent Involvement Component next year to better approximate the requirements of ESEA guidelines.

Conduct more workshops in which teachers can apply new theories and materials.

SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Detailed Report

The following variables and data collection devices were used to evaluate the degree of success in achievement of component objectives: scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test, Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills and the Wide Range Achievement Test; and teacher ratings of inservice education and assessment.

Objective: To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Standardized tests were given to pupils in two special education elementary schools. The interval between pre and post administrations at all grade levels was seven months. Children in kindergarten and first grade were given the Metropolitan Readiness Test. Mean raw score percentiles based on national norms for kindergarten and first-grade pupils increased from 18.3 to 33.5 and from 34.5 to 52.1, respectively. Results for other grades are shown in Table A.

TABLE A

READING TEST SCORES - PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Grade Level	Test	Number of Pupils	Median Pretest Grade Equivalent	Median Posttest Grade Equivalent	Gain in Months
2	Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary	46	1.0	1.3	3
2	Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension	46	1.0	1.3	3
3	Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary	46	1.6	2.2	6
3	Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension	46	1.3	1.6	3
4	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills	34	1.2	2.4	12
5	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills	26	1.0	2.1	11
6	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills	23	1.3	2.1	8

Pupils in the mathematics component also were tested pre and post, with a 6.5-month interval between the tests. Above-average gains were made at each grade level tested, as indicated in Table B.

TABLE B

MATHEMATICS TEST SCORES - PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Grade Level	Test	Number of Pupils	Pretest Median Grade Equivalent	Posttest Median Grade Equivalent	Gain in Months
4	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills	28	2.2	3.2	10
5	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills	25	1.4	2.3	9
6	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills	23	1.7	2.9	12

The Wide Range Achievement Test was given to ungraded elementary level pupils at the Exceptional Children's Opportunity School, a nonpublic school for disadvantaged, handicapped children. The time interval between the pretest and posttest was seven months. The results are shown in Table C.

TABLE C

WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST - NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Subtest	Number of Pupils	Pretest Median Grade Equivalent	Posttest Median Grade Equivalent	Gain in Months
Reading	29	1.2	2.4	12
Arithmetic	35	1.3	1.5	2

Objective: To identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process.

Assessment of public school pupils in four specialized classrooms at Pacific Boulevard School was accomplished by the administration of tests and the

keeping of anecdotal records, by teachers, and by preparation of case studies prepared with the assistance of the school's Special Education Counselor. Examples of learning disabilities included inability to pronounce new words, spell, read sentences, or comprehend paragraphs. The culmination of the three-week stay by ten pupils in the assessment room was the preparation of specific recommendations for the regular classroom teacher to remediate pupil problems. Some pupils had multiple problems and were either held in the same room for a longer interval or were assigned to one of the other specialized classrooms.

In the nonpublic school project, supportive services were given to the instructional programs at three schools, the Exceptional Children's Opportunity School, the Exceptional Children's Foundation, and the Imperial Nursery, an institution for preschool-aged children. A speech therapist provided diagnostic services to these schools, and 57 pupils were assessed in language development areas.

A team of professional experts at the Exceptional Children's Foundation (ECF) gathered evaluative information on their own pupils and prepared a case file write-up on each of 35 children. Seventeen additional pupils identified as capable of succeeding in the public school program were referred to appropriate classes in public school, and their psychological profiles were immediately updated to facilitate their transfer.

Through consultation and/or inservice demonstration, ECF teachers were provided with suggestions for amelioration of problems through classroom activities. Such consultation and demonstration focused on both individual and group processes. A broad spectrum, therefore, of prescriptive techniques based upon various assessments in each of the areas was used to help set appropriate goals for each child.

An additional activity provided audiological examinations and evaluation for speech and/or language defects to disadvantaged, nonpublic school children. An audiologist and speech pathologist located at the Center for the Study of Speech and Hearing, which is sponsored by the University of Southern California, evaluated the children. An individual study was made of each pupil referred, with the type of data gathered depending on the pupil's particular needs. Information pertinent to the assessment was recorded on an individual clinic form. Twenty-two of the 51 children evaluated by the speech teacher returned on a regular basis for speech therapy.

Objective: To provide inservice education.

Seventy-three teachers from Special Schools attended a four-day, Title III-funded workshop on materials and techniques held at the close of the school year. Eight teachers from Title I schools were among the participants. Each teacher selected four of the eight scheduled sessions devoted to the improvement of instruction. On a 1-5, poor to good, scale, teachers gave ratings of 4 or higher as follows: adequacy of content, 77%, adequacy of presentation, 70%; appropriateness of topic, 70%; and use of instructional aids, 82%. Participants were asked to comment on the sessions. Of 34 multiple responses pertaining to the content of the workshop, 10 responses stated that much of the material was reiterative of previous courses or overlapping within this workshop, five indicated some vital areas had been omitted, four liked the emphasis on machines and materials, four did not like this emphasis, four suggested a

clarification of objectives and terms, and three rated the content generally excellent.

Of the 51 responses pertaining to its organization, 14 mentioned the inadequate time allotted certain phases, and 13 requested a chance to sample all the workshops. Of five responses rating workshop personnel, three were complimentary. Of 29 miscellaneous responses, 15 spoke of the workshops as being generally very helpful. Seven teachers expressed a desire that the workshop be repeated at their own schools so they could attend those sessions that they had missed.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The 25 regular teachers at Pacific Boulevard School were asked to evaluate the Assessment-Service Center concept. Results from the 19 forms that were returned are shown in Table D. Eight teachers noted that they were able to try out some or most of the recommendations submitted to them. Seven teachers were able to try out very few or none of the recommendations.

TABLE D

SERVICE TEACHERS' EVALUATIONS OF ASSESSMENT

1. For all the pupils returning to your classroom from an assessment room, how many of the total recommendations were you able to try out?

   all 0 most 2 some 6 very few 4 none 3

2. Of those recommendations that you tried, how many had at least some degree of success?

   all 0 most 2 some 7 very few 3 none 1

3. For those recommendations you were unable to try, which of the following reasons apply? (Check as many as apply.)

6 child changed room	4 unable to fit into class schedule
1 materials unavailable	1 not enough pupil information
1 too much preparation time	0 inappropriate
6 had already tried it	0 disagreed with recommendation

4. If the assessment-service program continues, how would you prefer your pupils to be scheduled for the 15 days of assessment?

   full days 5 half days 3 1 period a day 3

5. To what degree has your teaching been facilitated as a result of the recommendations from the assessment teacher?

   very much 1 some 8 very little 3 not at all 1

6. If it were not possible to retain all four assessment rooms, rank the order in which you feel they should be retained.
   (1 = most important, 4 = least important)
   (Weighted results were as follows:
   1. communication, 2. visual motor, 3. behavior, 4. reading)

Regular teachers also were asked what types of pupil information they felt they should have been given but were not. Of the 19 forms returned, eight commented on this problem: of these, three asked for health information, two wanted background on the pupil's previous classroom performance, one wanted to know how to incorporate pupil information into a team schedule, one claimed that no information had been provided, and one indicated that no additional information was needed.

These teachers also were asked for additional comments or suggestions for improvement of the program. Seven offered no comment or said none of their children were involved with assessment services this year. The remainder provided 17 multiple responses, of which nine suggested a better tie-in between assessment services and the regular classroom; two, more appropriate scheduling of time in the classroom; two, more individualizing of instruction; and two, greater use of the District's supportive services.

The six members of the school staff involved in assessment were asked to comment on the component's strengths. Of seven multiple responses three praised team cooperation within the assessment area; two endorsed the follow-up conferences, reports, and recommendations; and two expressed appreciation of the supportive services.

Of nine multiple comments on component weaknesses, seven pointed to the lack of a truly collaborative and supportive relationship between staff and other teachers. Of 12 recommendations for next year, seven indicated a need for greater coordination and availability among personnel; and five wanted adjustments in the time spent with the children (some asking for more time with fewer students, some for working with more groups each day, and some for making the time variable with the child's needs).

The speech therapist for nonpublic school children felt that a weakness of the program was overemphasis on testing, at the expense of linguistic development. She recognized the need for intelligence testing to facilitate proper placement, but felt that testing otherwise should remain at a minimum.